

by hatred of the monarchy and its terrorist regime and the foreign governments which have imposed it upon an unwilling people. By aiding a weak and inefficient government to suppress opposition by force of arms, we are eliminating the only real alternative to communism—a liberal, progressive government responsive to the needs of Greece. By eliminating a middle-of-the-road possibility of peaceful change, we force the Greek people to choose either the extreme of Fascist monarchy or the other extreme of revolutionary communism—we would leave them no other choice. That is not the effective way to stop communism in Greece.

The present Greek Government has driven many a conservative businessman in Greece to feel that, although he hated communism, he would accept any help that enabled Greeks to throw out the fascism of the monarchy.

An UNRRA worker recently returned from Greece told me of a conversation with a prosperous Greek who is the head of a large Greek shipping firm, who said, "I am an EAM because I feel as you Americans did in 1776. We want to govern ourselves. We do not want these foreigners pushing us around and enriching themselves on our country any more than you Americans did."

Mr. President, these are people who would not support a Communist Party in Greece or a Socialist Party in Greece. They are people who want a middle-of-the-road government. But they passionately insist upon self-government; and if we insist on supporting a monarchy which suppresses all opposition, we shall drive them to take the only alternative—the extreme revolutionary course. If we endorse the King's government as our concept of democracy, we shall have given Europe a false impression of our own great country, and shall have forever discredited our own philosophy in their eyes.

Mr. President, I think that when we give financial aid to Greece, we must insist that the money contributed by the American taxpayers is wisely used, and is used for the benefit of the needy people of Greece. It should not be controlled by the royalist members of the Greek ruling class who, as collaborationists, fared as well under the German occupation as they did under the British. Almost all qualified observers will state, as the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization stated, that aid to Greece should be conditioned upon the adoption of a more efficient and more democratic government in Greece.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say a word about Turkey. It is often forgotten that half of the President's proposal is concerned with Turkey. Turkey has absolutely no relief needs. Not a single bomb dropped on Turkey. During the war it enjoyed one long, lush, uninterrupted war boom. It sold supplies to both sides; and both sides paid, and paid very well. The only purpose of aid for Turkey is a military one.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and I have introduced an alternative resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 93, to deal with this great problem. Briefly, our resolution would, first, appro-

priate funds for relief and rebuilding of Greece; second, provide for the administration of that relief by the United Nations; and, third, request the General Assembly of the United Nations to institute a full-scale investigation with a view to resolving not only the Greek crisis but the problems of Palestine, the Dardanelles, and Middle East oil. I should like to point out that our joint resolution provides for immediate assistance through a stopgap advance of \$100,000,000 by the RFC. It does not delay this assistance until after the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly.

Our joint resolution is equally important for the things which it does not do. These are: First, it does not provide any funds for relief or military intervention in Turkey; second, it does not provide for the sending of American military forces into Greece; and, third, it does not provide for unilateral action by the United States or for bypassing the United Nations.

A momentous decision lies ahead of us, Mr. President. Upon it hangs the future of the great idea of permanent peace through international organization. Let us not abandon that great hope so soon after its birth.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of two resolutions which were unanimously ordered to be reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me inquire when the resolutions were ordered to be reported favorably.

Mr. BROOKS. The day before yesterday.

Mr. WHITE. I do not wish to object, but I would suggest to the Senator from Illinois that at the present time there is a rather small attendance in the Senate for the transaction of business.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I recognize the principle the majority leader is trying to uphold, and I subscribe to it. So I shall wait until Tuesday to take up these matters.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Maine, the majority leader, for the course he is following. There are not many in attendance on this side of the aisle at this particular moment. I also thank the Senator from Illinois for not pressing his request.

Mr. WHITE. If there is no other business to come before the Senate, I shall move a recess.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Before the Senator from Maine makes the motion, I wonder if he can tell us when we are to have another executive session.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, there are only three nominations on the executive calendar. I shall move an executive session when the number of names on the calendar seems to justify it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is on the calendar the nomination of Gordon R. Clapp to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, on which the committee made an adverse report. I think the Senate

should act on that nomination, one way or the other, at a reasonably early date.

Mr. WHITE. I quite agree with the Senator from New Mexico. The nomination has been on the calendar for some days. I agree with the Senator that at an early date the Senate should devote itself to the consideration of the nomination, and if I can further that end, I shall be most happy to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sorry the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the chairman of the committee which considered the nomination, is not present at the moment. I am sure that he would like to get action on the nomination one way or the other as soon as possible.

Mr. WHITE. I shall cooperate in any way I can to get action on that and the other nominations on the calendar.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, April 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Hugh L. C. Wilkerson	William J. Brown
Daniel J. Daley	Luther L. Terry

SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Maurice LeBosquet, Jr.

SCIENTISTS TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Howard L. Andrews
Heinz Specht
G. Robert Coatney

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Carruth J. Wagner	Robert W. Rasor
William L. Hewitt	George A. Shipman

SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS TO BE TEMPORARY SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Frank Tetzlaff
Albert H. Stevenson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Dr. Joseph Francis Thorning, associate editor of the *Americas* and World Affairs and rector of St. Joseph's Church, Carrollton Manor, Md., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Almighty Father, look down with favor upon the Speaker of this House and all

the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Remembering the devoted cooperation of the other American Republics and Canada in an hour of trial, we beg the help of Thy grace on Pan-American Day for constancy in the cause of Western Hemisphere solidarity.

Bestow Thy benediction, dear Saviour, upon all peoples who honor their obligations as good neighbors. Instruct their minds and guide their hearts in the courses of true friendship. Inspire the children of the Americas with the love of truth, justice, and freedom. Grant that they may fit the values of inter-American friendship into the framework of world order.

This we ask through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 10, 1947, was read and approved.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on April 10, 1947, he did, on April 11, 1947, sign the following enrolled bills:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chi-
arodo; and

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M.
Lorraine.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. April 12, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,

House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority granted on April 10, the Clerk received the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate, namely:

On April 11, the engrossed bill of the Senate, S. 1009, entitled "An act to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale," attested as having passed the Senate on April 10, 1947.

On April 12, a message that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 875) entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites."

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THE LABOR BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 178, Rept. No. 248), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and man-

agement in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to read Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the two hundred and fourth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, perhaps the greatest political philosopher of all time.

The Communist propagandists throughout the world, and especially in this country, are using every method to try to convince the people of the earth that both Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln were Communists at heart. If Jefferson and Lincoln were here today, they would both spurn communism as they would spurn poison.

This address of Thomas Jefferson has been referred to by historians as having the greatest influence historically of any address ever delivered in either ancient or modern times. It is his first inaugural address of March 4, 1801, in which he said:

Friends and fellow citizens: Called upon to undertake the duties of the first Executive office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow citizens which is here assembled, to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look toward me, to declare a sincere consciousness that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising Nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye—when I contemplate these transcendent objects, and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country committed to the issue and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contemplation, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly indeed, should I despair, did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me, that in the other high authorities provided by our Constitution, I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign functions of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may

enable us to steer with safety the vessel in which we are all embarked amid the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussion and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the Nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law and unite in common effort for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; that this should divide opinions as to measure of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all republicans—we are federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this Government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not, I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest Government on earth. I believe it is the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us then, with courage and confidence, pursue our own Federal and republican principles—our attachment to our Union and representative government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one-quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the hundredth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow citizens, resulting not from birth but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them including honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an

overruling providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter; with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship, with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the state governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil, over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the text of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair, then, fellow citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this, the greatest of all, I have learned to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence reposed in our first and great revolutionary character, whose preeminent services had entitled him to the first place in his country's love, and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall often be

thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional; and your support against the errors of others, who may condemn what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a consolation to me for the past; and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.

Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power, which rules the destinies of the universe, lead our councils to what is best, and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on Pan-American Day to record our appreciation for the work of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, an apostle of the good-neighbor policy. Years before inter-American friendship was recognized as a vital phase of hemisphere defense, Dr. Thorning was lecturing in the universities of Central and South America, in Portuguese, Spanish, and French. His chief purpose has been to interest young people in the opportunities for building friendship in schools, colleges, and universities. His articles on Costa Rica, Uruguay, Colombia, Brazil, Mexico, and Cuba have been translated into numerous languages. Everywhere in the other American Republics this great priest, scholar, and educator has emphasized the importance of sound social legislation on behalf of the miners, farmers, and factory workers. He knows that property and income are sure foundations for democratic thinking and living. His efforts have been progressive and liberal in the best sense of those terms. I am happy that he is with us on Pan-American Day and trust that his health will support numerous future labors in a noble cause.

THE LATE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us enjoyed listening to the message of a great American as read by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Last Saturday was the second anniversary of the death of another truly great American and a great humanitarian. Shortly before he quietly passed away 2 years ago last Saturday in Warm Springs, Ga., Franklin Roosevelt wrote a brief message to the American people. I desire in this 1 minute to quote the

closing lines of that message. President Roosevelt said:

The only limitations to our achievements of tomorrow are our fears and doubts of today. Let us move forward with a strong and active faith.

Mr. Speaker, in a day when we are beset by fears and uncertainties, that challenge from President Roosevelt rings with strength, clarity, and courage as a guide for this hour. Let us, indeed, move forward with a strong and active faith.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank R. Kent appearing in the Evening Star April 11, 1947.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the Michigan State committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News.

NATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL WEEK

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, this day, April 14, marks the opening of National Sunday School Week, an annual observance sponsored by the Laymen's National Council.

Founded in England, the Sunday school became firmly established in this country in the early nineteenth century. More than one-half of all Sunday schools in the world are in America. It would be helpful to know how much of the greatness of America stems out of this little-known fact.

Certainly no movement has contributed more to the moral advancement of our civilization than the Sunday school. With inspired energy and prayerful devotion the Sunday schools of America have taught unnumbered millions the true ends of life and the spiritual laws governing the universe.

The Sunday school teaches the faith of our fathers. The Sunday school, like all Christianity, teaches that man lives best by that great injunction of the lowly Nazarene:

Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

This observance calls attention to a solemn truth—that unless we quickly dedicate our national life to His teachings, our physical and material well-being must soon disappear. There is no way of obtaining God's blessing but obedience to His laws.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today we again welcome the opportunity to celebrate Pan-American Day. So on this April 14, 1947, it may be well for us to pause and reflect upon its truly historical significance. For us in the New World it is a day peculiarly our own—the day of the Americas—when Americans both to the north and south can join hands to bring about a better understanding of one another, and cement hemispheric solidarity.

Let us therefore briefly review the progress which the Americans have made in the past, examine the problems of today, and our plans for the future.

It seems particularly desirable that we do so because next to the ultimate goal of a successful United Nations, hemispheric unity is of the utmost importance to the people of the Americas. Just as during the war the Western Hemisphere was the second line of defense and progress for the United States, so it can be a bulwark for peace and progress in the world under the framework of the United Nations.

In these anxious times when nations are wearily striving for an enduring peace in spite of overwhelming difficulties, the example of the Americas might well be taken as a guiding light for this troubled world.

Painfully, with measured steps, and in spite of many weaknesses and misunderstandings, the nations of the Americas have progressed along a weary road until now they clearly understand that while they are equal independent and sovereign nations, at the same time they are interdependent neighbors with similar problems. The crucible of the war brought them together to find victory through their united front.

As far back as 1810 the eminent Chilean Don Juan Egaña made the first proposal for pan-American unity, foreseeing with statesmanlike outlook the importance of unity of purpose and policy of the American Republics.

Many important steps have been taken to increase the effectiveness of the inter-American system and of course one of the greatest of these was the founding of the Pan American Union 56 years ago today.

Another was when President Hoover, 16 years ago, proclaimed April 14, 1931, as Pan-American Day.

From a series of inter-American conferences a better understanding was brought about and the keystone for closer ties of friendship was the machinery set up "for prompt consultation on matters of common concern."

In 1940 at Habana it was recognized an aggression on the territory or sovereignty of any nation in the Americas should be considered as an aggression against all.

These policies led ultimately to the Act of Chapultepec at Mexico City where it was agreed not only acts of aggression from without should be the concern of all, but also acts of aggression from

within the hemisphere against another American state.

The United Nations at San Francisco recognized the importance of such regional arrangements by approving of such agreements in its Charter just as the signers of the Act of Chapultepec recognized the United Nations by agreeing its activities should be "consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization."

So today the Americas have adopted a charter of their own to keep the peace. The 3,000-mile unfortified border between Canada and the United States, the towering figure of the Christ of the Andes high on the border between Chile and Argentina take on a new and added significance.

As I have indicated there have been many factors which have tended to bring about hemispheric security and to consolidate the ties of understanding and confraternity.

Among these is the fact that the Americas of all the areas of the world are best suited for geographical unity. Without the racial and historic prejudices of the Old World, they comprise an area equal to 25 percent of the globe—consisting of 12,000,000 square miles of the richest and most diversified resources of the world. Their climates and crops supplement each other which in and of itself draws the peoples of the hemisphere closer together and creates bonds of solidarity.

Just as we, in the years past, fought and died for our independence in the New World, so did the patriots of our neighbors to the south fight for the independence of their respective countries. This, too, provides a common bond of understanding as all these countries have heritages dedicated to the same ideals of independence of nations.

I need not add that in the fields of culture, music, art, and sciences there are great opportunities for progress because contacts of this character ignore national borders and local differences.

One of the best examples of the friendly feeling between ourselves and our American neighbors is that in the Americas alone of all the world there are no quota restrictions on immigration to this country.

While I have recited many instances of progress which we in the Americas have made in the past it does little good to blink at the fact that there are still many problems to be solved.

All too often, up to the present time, there have been entirely too many coups, revolutions, and internal troubles in many of the countries of this hemisphere, including our own. There has been serious penetrations of both Red fascism and Red communism with its usual exploitation of false hope for the improvement of social and economic conditions for the people.

Certainly there can be great improvement on the part of the responsible governments so infested to align ourselves against these totalitarian and foreign doctrines, and to continue to be identified with economic progress, liberalism, and liberty rather than opportunism.

Certainly the United States, through its technical genius and know-how, can do much to bring about the economic improvements to which the Communists only give lip service. But if such aid is rendered, it must be on a truly reciprocal basis. It can no longer be on a one-way street, disguised as a good-neighbor policy. One cannot have good neighbors unless you keep good fences, and that means each must do their part in keeping them in repair.

There is another situation that currently exists which is hurting our friendship with the nations to the south of us. That is the present misunderstanding between our country and the Argentine. This problem is entirely too important to be decided by personalities, and I am hopeful our State Department will make every effort to settle this dispute on a friendly and equitable basis. It must, however, be settled right. Every nation in this hemisphere has the right to expect other nations to live up to and carry out their international agreements and to determine for itself when those promises have been complied with. But if on a high policy level our State Department has reached an impasse because of sincere differences of opinion as to the facts of the case, I strongly urge that other methods be devised so that we can determine case by case whether there has been actual implementation of the international obligations agreed to by the Argentine.

It is all-important that this should be done immediately. To settle this dispute would be to the mutual advantage of all concerned. Already the Rio Conference has been delayed too long. We should be getting on with the mutual-assistance pacts for our common security. Certainly there is sufficient basic convergence of hemispheric interests to make this military cooperation mutually desirable.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, which passed unanimously the inter-American military cooperation bill on June 5, 1946, I urge our State and military departments again to get behind this all-important bill for hemispheric security.

Also as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, whose functions deal primarily with inter-American affairs, I urge not only our Government to implement the Act of Chapultepec by ratifying it in treaty form, but urge the appropriate legislative bodies of the other American Republics which have not already done so to do likewise in accordance with their constitutions.

In closing may I add one other word. The so-called good-neighbor policy is not dependent on any one administration for its execution. This policy is a continuing one and rests upon a much sounder foundation. It is the universal desire of the vast majority of our people, which transcends partisan considerations, to have hemispheric unity for the betterment of us all—not just for the present but as a permanent policy.

Therefore, let us improve the inter-American system and remember its

interdependence is its foundation, cooperation is its keystone.

CHICAGO, THE PROGRESSIVE CITY

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, various Members of the House have risen to tell about the beauties of their States or their districts. I rise to tell of the enterprise and progress shown in the Ninth Congressional District of Illinois, in the great city of Chicago. The motto of the city of Chicago is "I will." Right in my very own district, plans for a \$200,000,000 development of upper Michigan Avenue, from the Chicago River to Oak Street, were presented on Wednesday, April 9, to business and financial leaders of the district at a luncheon by Arthur Rubloff, a Chicago realtor. The program calls for a series of office buildings, shops, hotels, and apartment buildings, as well as underground parking facilities. This project has been described as an effort to turn this stretch of Michigan Avenue into the most modern mile in the world.

I am happy to call your attention to the enterprise being shown in the great city of Chicago and my own congressional district. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, a \$200,000,000 project. This should serve as an example to the rest of the United States.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 731) to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 5, after "National", insert "Memorial."

Page 5, line 1, after "National", insert "Memorial."

Page 5, line 21, after "National", insert "Memorial."

Page 5, line 22, strike out "5" and insert "6."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand that this is simply concurring in the Senate amendments, and the gentleman has already discussed this matter with the minority leadership; is that correct?

Mr. LEMKE. I have.

Mr. PRIEST. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frederick C. Othman of the United Press.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in each to include excerpts.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Donald R. Richberg.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three resolutions adopted by the Fifty-second General Assembly of Iowa.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a report from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LONGE) before the Connecticut Air Power Conference, and further to extend his remarks and include a radio interview.

A BANKER'S VIEW OF THE GRECO-TURKISH LOAN PROPOSAL

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I asked an official of a small-town bank what he thought about the President's proposal with regard to Greece and Turkey and all its implications. He said that unless there was some good secret reason for it, he was opposed to it. He said he had heard no good reason and therefore supposes that if there is one it must be secret. He further said that the proposition of trying to buy friendship and buy off communism had been tried by us in South America without outstanding success. He said there is a grave question in his mind as to how far we can go with this thing without upsetting our own financial stability. He suggests that perhaps we had better concentrate on the Communists at home first.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if Henry Wallace were a citizen and former high official of the country whose cause he now espouses and had followed the inexcusable course of attempting openly to alienate a friendly country, he would be shot, or otherwise liquidated, as soon as he returned home. Fortunately for him, we do not employ such extreme measures. Probably he has contravened no criminal statute. At any rate, that is for the Attorney General to determine.

Certain it is, however, that Mr. Wallace has earned for himself the unenviable position of a pariah among patriots of either political party. Only last fall this same spokesman gave our party an unsolicited boost by his infamous speech to his radical cheering section in Madison Square Garden when he tried to pull the rug out from under the feet of Secretary Byrnes, who was then striving to represent this Nation as best he could at the Paris Conference under the most trying and difficult circumstances. Those of us who were candidates for office, though sincerely regretting the incident, and in many cases frankly stating so, were not blind to the service, no doubt, unwittingly rendered our cause.

But none of us can now feel anything but national shame over the spectacle presented by a man who has been honored by the second highest office in the land traveling to a foreign country with which we have enjoyed cordial and intimate relations and seeking withdrawal of its support for us and our policies because his country has embarked on a program of "ruthless imperialism" as he puts it. His overworked apologists may attribute his remarks to pique, frustration, or befuddlement. In any event they are disgraceful.

Another unfortunate result is that such a disloyal outburst militates against a consideration of the program for aid to Greece and Turkey on the merits. Mr. Wallace has done more to advance that cause than perhaps anyone else. Many of us are still studying the proposal, and all the suggested amendments and modifications, and have not yet taken a final position. But none of us, even those violently opposed to the program, wants to be associated in the public mind with Mr. Wallace or his kind.

It is reported that the Manchester Guardian, traditionally liberal, was sarcastic in its pointed rebukes for the round denunciation of the selfishness of the United States by one described as "so distinguished an American," adding that it was not necessary to win their attention with such bait and describing his talk as "more picturesque than exact."

"Befuddled" is the charitable adjective selected as appropriate to describe this outburst in the editorial from the Washington Post which, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote:

BEFUDDLED MR. WALLACE

Just what Henry Wallace hopes to accomplish by denouncing abroad the foreign

policy of the Government of which he was so recently a part is a mystery that we do not pretend to fathom. It may be that he is only trying to enhance his popularity among the left-wing groups who are fighting the foreign policy of Britain's labor government. Or he may be sincerely seeking to drive a wedge between the United States and Britain as a means of defeating the policy to which his own country is committing itself. The one thing certain is that his indiscretion has thwarted any worthy purpose—however muddled the thinking behind it may have been—which could be reasonably attributed to him.

The pertinent facts about Mr. Wallace are these: Last September, while he was Secretary of Commerce, he attempted to modify the direction of American foreign policy by making a speech sharply at variance with the views of the State Department. He claimed Presidential approval for his utterance and President Truman unwittingly reinforced that assumption without knowing the full implications of the Wallace speech. When the subsequent controversy brought a show-down, the President asked Mr. Wallace to resign. Since that time he has in various ways carried his case to the American people with disappointing results for himself. Now, having failed to make any real impression on his countrymen, he is carrying his case to other nations. His speech in London can be read in no other light than as an attempt to induce the British to run out on the United States after this Government has agreed to share what has heretofore been a British obligation of preserving the independence of Greece.

This is such atrociously unstatesmanlike conduct that it appears to have shocked many Britons who share Mr. Wallace's dislike for what has now become known as the Truman Doctrine. Worse still, in carrying this fight over domestic policy to foreign shores Mr. Wallace is employing methods that are discredited in even our domestic political squabbles. He bases his whole argument upon a gross distortion of the President's policy. He is quoted as saying that it "offers unconditional aid to anti-Soviet governments" and as implying that the Administration has "set out to police Russia's borders." Coming from a Moscow propagandist, such wild misstatements could be properly discounted by the peoples of other countries. But when uttered by a former member of Mr. Truman's Cabinet, even a sour and disgruntled member, they will inevitably deceive many people and put the country which once elected Mr. Wallace as Vice President in a false light before the world.

It is difficult to see, therefore, how Mr. Wallace could have rendered a greater disservice to his country than he has done by carrying his confused and tortured protest abroad. While proclaiming the idea of one world he is trying to create new areas of disunity. While asking \$50,000,000,000 for reconstruction, he is opposing smaller-scale reconstruction on the only feasible basis that it can be granted to such countries as Greece. His performance is so flagrantly incompatible with the idea of world freedom and peace, which he professes to sponsor, that its chief effect may well be to add to the befuddlement which surrounds the name of Henry Wallace.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from New York has just said, I should like to make the obser-

vation that Mr. Wallace has been talking as if he were on his way to Moscow with no intention of coming back, for certainly he has made of himself the proper subject matter of attention by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Department of Justice. I should also like to express the hope that the President will cease to hope for his recovery from his Communist entanglements.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I have a post card from someone in my district this morning which I think refers to the same individual that the gentleman from Georgia is talking about. It says:

Hadn't you better yank our big mouth home? He doesn't look nice with his spite showing. Better men have been hung for less.

I wonder if United States good-natured fools are going to forget and forgive again.

Mr. COX. No; I would let him go.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, there could be an endless parade of speeches here on the subject of one mendacious idiot, Henry Wallace. He may not be guilty of treason; I have not looked into that; but he is guilty of unquestionably showing the world the spots beneath his raiment. He never got out of his craw the fact that one Harry Truman defeated him for the Vice Presidency in the days of that now famous remark, "Clear everything with Sidney." I think his speeches in Europe clearly indicate that they have been cleared with Joe Stalin. Apropos of what my very distinguished friend the gentleman from Georgia said, now that he is in Moscow or on his way there, the President should do him the favor of revoking his passport and leave him with a long-lost friend with whom he is more at home than he is with the American people. He does not express the feeling of the people of my State, and I venture to say, with the exception of a small bunch of pinks in certain areas of this country, he has the unqualified, unquestioned, unmitigated disapproval of the rank and file of the honest-to-God American people of this country.

HENRY A. WALLACE VIOLATING THE LAW

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the State Department should revoke the passports of Henry Wallace and his pal, William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party. I call your attention to the fact that they are both violating the law. I want to read the law to you. Page 459, of

title 18, Criminal Code, chapter 1, section 5, which is known as the Logan Act, reads as follows:

Every citizen of the United States, whether actually resident or abiding within the same, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or in any foreign country, who, without the permission or authority of the Government, directly or indirectly, commences or carries on any verbal or written correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with an intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the Government of the United States; and every person, being a citizen of or resident within the United States or in any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, and not duly authorized, who counsels, advises, or assists in any such correspondence with such intent, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 and imprisoned not more than 3 years.

That is the law today.

We should wake up the Department of Justice and tell them to quit following around after the antidefamation league and enforce the laws enacted by the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include two letters, one from the Secretary of War, and an answer thereto from Mr. Matthew Woll of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the newspaper of our distinguished former colleague, Bert Snell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DAVID LILIENTHAL TO HIRE DAUGHTER

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a brief but important fact. Nancy Lillenthal, an active and sympathetic pro-Communist leader of the United States Workers' Local 10, in the Department of Labor, which local has been actively opposing the President's loyalty program, is about to leave the Department of Labor to work privately on confidential matters with her father, David Lillenthal, the newly appointed head of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In this connection, the following portion of an article which appeared in the February 1947 issue of Plain Talk should be of interest:

His daughter, Nancy, an employee of the Department of Labor and a member of the United Public Workers, a Communist-dominated union, only recently displayed her

strong pro-Soviet attitude. At the beginning of December 1946, at a meeting of her local, a proposal had been made to endorse the resolution of the Atlantic City CIO convention condemning communism. The fight against the endorsement was led, with success, by Nancy Lillenthal. It may be that Nancy's outlook had been conditioned not by her father, but by her mother. For Mrs. Lillenthal is reliably reported to have belonged in the middle thirties to several "front" organizations.

I sincerely trust for the future security of the United States that President Truman will see that all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission are investigated by a competent board to determine their loyalty.

After all, it is a privilege to be an employee of our Federal Government, and not a right.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to make the observation that the appointment of Mr. Lillenthal to the Atomic Energy Commission is one thing that only God himself can explain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the dean of the University of Connecticut with reference to certain educational measures now pending.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article from today's Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Legislature of the State of North Dakota and certain excerpts.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PANAMA CANAL

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and other members of the overall committee, have returned from a visit

to the Panama Canal, where we inspected all facilities. As you know, betterments of the Canal are proposed, ranging from improving the present Canal to building a sea-level canal at different places, and including Panama. This will cost all the way from \$200,000,000 to \$2,700,000,000 on original estimates.

I am sure our visit will prove very worth while in appraising any of the projects as they are finally submitted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS] has expired.

ARMY UNIFORMS IN EUROPE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement entitled "The Army Seeks Uniforms in Europe."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this article entitled "The Army Seeks Uniforms in Europe" was taken from the Boston Herald of April 9, 1947. It states that the Army wants to spend \$10,000,000 buying cloth for our own Army. It seems to me, when we have a bill pending before the Congress to try to keep up the price of wool, in order to keep labor employed in Massachusetts and other States of the Union where the woolen mills are running only part time, that the Congress should see that legislation is enacted to retain the tariff on merchandise, or the first thing we know the plants of this country will be closed down; we will be buying our materials in foreign countries, and our own people will be walking the streets looking for work. It is about time we looked after America.

I want you to know that I am for America first, last, and all the time. The quicker the rest of you get on that bandwagon the better it is going to be for the country.

The news article to which I referred follows:

ARMY SEEKS UNIFORMS IN EUROPE

LONDON.—An American Army purchasing mission was reported heading for Germany with a \$10,000,000 cloth order that neither United States nor British manufacturers wanted.

The British board of trade confirmed that it turned down an American request for 5,000,000 yards of olive-drab worsted to be delivered within the next 6 to 9 months.

A board of trade spokesman said he heard that the buying mission, headed by a Colonel Steadman, had gone to Frankfurt in the hope of getting the goods from German textile mills. The American Embassy said it had no knowledge of the mission.

British manufacturers turned down the order, the board of trade spokesman said, because it was too large to fit into the strictly regulated manufacturing program without upsetting export quotas or the already short domestic market.

An informed source said it was understood the Army buyers came to Britain for the cloth—needed for winter uniforms for American Army—because the United States Army now had to compete in the open market with private buyers for American cloth.

"Governments always have a hard time buying," a board of trade spokesman said. "Manufacturers would rather sell to private buyers and thereby build up good will."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale News.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a copy of a speech.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. HEBERT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio speech delivered last Friday, April 11.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, be given leave of absence for a period of 3 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

TERMINAL-LEAVE PAY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a message to this Congress from the legislature of the great State of South Carolina, that State which produced John C. Calhoun, Wade Hampton, and our former Secretary of State, Jimmy Byrnes. The message to this House is a concurrent resolution requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal-leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds.

This House has been in session since the 3rd of January on which date I introduced H. R. 3, providing for payment of these bonds in cash. H. R. 3 has been pending all that time, yet Congress has done nothing. This resolution from the Legislature of the State of South Carolina was introduced in the Senate on March 11, 1947, and was passed on March 12; and sent to the House and considered on March 27 and adopted April 1, 1947. They do things in South Carolina, but here Congress seems to be laying down on the job in providing cash payment for terminal leave bonds, for the boys who deserve cash if they want it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the legislature had anything to say about the need of returning the atomic bomb to the hands of the Army?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. They did not express themselves on that but they did express themselves on the matter of paying terminal-leave pay in cash to the veteran.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as was said by the Chaplain in his most appropriate prayer, this is Pan-American Day, which has become a very significant anniversary and a powerful influence in bringing about closer understanding between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. It is the one day set aside by the governments of an entire continent to symbolize their common bond and their common hope for a system of international relations based on mutual respect and cooperation. In that direction lies peace.

The legislative situation was such this year that it did not seem appropriate to ask that today be set aside exclusively for the commemoration of Pan-American Day as occurred the last 2 years. I cannot, however, permit the occasion to pass without further calling attention to it and expressing the hope that the situation may be such next year that this day may be set aside exclusively for that purpose and that such may become an annual custom in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 180), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Pan American Union was founded on April 14, 1890, and the anniversary of that date is by custom and by designation of the Governing Board of the Union observed throughout the Republics of this hemisphere as Pan-American Day; and

Whereas at this time it is appropriate to recognize the high value of the work of the Pan American Union in furthering the close association of the American Republics: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That—

1. The House of Representatives hereby extends to the other popular representative organs of each of the other American Republics its cordial good wishes on this auspicious day; and

2. The Pan American Union is felicitated on this occasion of its anniversary; and

3. Copies of the present resolution shall be distributed to the legislative bodies of the other American Republics, and one copy shall be transmitted to the Pan American Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

XCHH—212

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles, one entitled "Can an Economic Depression Be Avoided," and the other entitled "Who Said Prices Would Fall?"

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Marine Corps League Bulletin, entitled "The Hatchet Men Are Out Again."

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Report 209 from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DR. JOSEPH FRANCIS THORNING

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, may I say for myself, and I am sure I speak for the other Members of the House, that it was with extreme pleasure today that we listened to the beautiful prayer of the Reverend Joseph Francis Thorning. We want to extend our thanks to Dr. Montgomery for having made the visit of Father Thorning possible.

It is my opinion that Father Thorning is one of the outstanding men of the Nation on Latin-American relations, and knows as much as or even more, than any man in America today concerning our Latin-American neighbors.

I trust we shall have the pleasure of seeing and hearing him again on Pan-American Day next year.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 179.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That on Monday, the 19th day of May 1947, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on House Administration under the provisions of clause (1) (j) (2) (C) of rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave for

sixty legislative days to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the life, character, and public service of deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order, and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned. The necessary expenses connected with such memorial services shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration and approved by such committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois if this is the usual resolution for memorial services in the House of Representatives?

Mr. BISHOP. It is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reference I made to the passage of the Pan-American resolution a few moments ago follow immediately after the remarks I previously made on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Pike County Republican, Pittsfield, Ill., entitled "Gentlemen of the Congress" and in the other an article appearing in the same publication entitled "Flood Waters Rising in Sny Valley."

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George Sokolsky.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HERTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

HENRY WALLACE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it appears today that we have an open season on Henry Wallace. Now, I never voted for Henry Wallace for Vice President. As a matter of fact, I was not a member of the Democratic Convention when they almost renominated him for Vice President again, and as far as he is concerned he never did me any harm. As a matter of fact, on my desk this morning, when I returned to Washington, I found a package of excellent Golden Bantam seed corn from Henry Wallace, so that I am not quarreling with him today. But I do not want to submerge the issue on this Greek-Turkish deal with any attack on Henry Wallace. I want to stick to the subject, and I want to cite the words of substantial American citizens like John Knight, of Akron, the publisher of the Akron Beacon-Journal, who in Sunday's issue of that newspaper stated that he was opposed to the Truman doctrine because—

(1) It destroys the original and fundamental concept of the United Nations; (2) commits the United States in the role of world policeman; (3) stems from the idea that you can buy good will and fight communism with dollars; (4) misleads the American people into believing that this is another glorious triumph for democracy; (5) issues an open invitation to war.

Mr. Speaker, does the bill proposed by President Truman make us a military ally of the present dictatorial Turkish Government? Is the bill for Turkish-Greek aid a military alliance? In effect, does not this bill make the Turkish Army a part of the American armed forces? In effect, are we not guaranteeing Turkish armed control of the Dardanelles? These are questions that need an answer.

A poem sent to me by another substantial citizen is as follows:

If a man has no freedom to fight for at home,
Let him battle for that of his neighbors;
Let him think of the glories of Greece and of Rome,

And be knocked on his head for his labors.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] received the same or a similar box of corn that I did. These samples of corn are a hybrid developed by the Wallace family. I regret these attacks that have been made upon Mr. Wallace today.

I agree to some extent with the position that the former Vice President has taken but I have some doubt of the propriety as to time and place. I certainly do not want to have this issue of a loan to Turkey submerged by attacking a great, good, sincere American Christian gentleman such as Henry Wallace. I think Mr. Wallace has as much right to advise the British people as Churchill has

to advise the American people. It is regrettable these unwarranted attacks have been made as I think that those who attack him are far more vulnerable than is this distinguished American.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of bills that will be called up by their respective subchairmen, and I first yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up H. R. 492, to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment, and ask for its immediate consideration, and I ask in connection with this bill and three other bills, Mr. Speaker, that we may consider them in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act of June 1, 1938, 52 Stat. 599 (11 D. C. Code 914), be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

"Sec. 13. If a child 16 years of age or older is charged with an offense which would amount to a felony in the case of an adult, or any child charged with an offense which if committed by an adult is punishable by death or life imprisonment, the judge may, after full investigation, waive jurisdiction and order such child held for trial under the regular procedure of the court which would have jurisdiction of such offense if committed by an adult; or such other court may exercise the powers conferred upon the juvenile court in this chapter in conducting and disposing of such cases."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of the House, this is a permissive bill to permit the judge of the juvenile court to waive the jurisdiction of the court in connection with a juvenile 16 years or older, if charged with an offense which would amount to a felony. This is brought about by the situation that under the present law the court cannot waive jurisdiction, and as a result a child who commits murder would only serve up to 21 years of age and then would be permitted to be at large.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 2, line 6, strike out "chapter" and insert "act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT TO CONTROL DANGEROUS WEAPONS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), be amended by changing the last period to a colon and adding the following language: "Provided, That arrests, searches, and seizures for violation of this section may be made by police officers upon probable cause, as for a felony."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after "Provided", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert "That arrests, without a warrant, and searches and seizures pursuant thereto, may be made for violation of this section, by police officers, as in the case of a felony, upon probable cause, that the person arrested is violating this section at the time of the arrest."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a brief word with reference to the reason for this legislation has been requested by the district attorney and by the corporation counsel, because of the situation which exists under present law, that arrests without a warrant cannot be made of persons carrying a gun. Obviously, in many cases these people of the underworld are carrying guns. This bill permits the police to make arrests of such persons, but only on condition that guns are found upon them and they are without a license for them.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE CODE OF LAW FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 495) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 826 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 2201), is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 826. Grand larceny: Whoever shall feloniously take and carry away anything of

value of the amount or value of \$200 or upward, including things savoring of the realty, shall suffer imprisonment for not less than 1 nor more than 10 years."

SEC. 2. That section 827 of said act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 2202), is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 827. Petit larceny; order of restitution: Whoever shall feloniously take and carry away any property of value of less than \$200, including things savoring of the realty, shall be fined not more than \$200 or be imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. And in all convictions for larceny, either grand or petit, the trial justice may, in his sound discretion, order restitution to be made of the value of the money or property shown to have been stolen by the defendant and made way with or otherwise disposed of and not recovered."

SEC. 3. That the first sentence of section 842 of said act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1301), is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 842. False pretenses: Whoever, by any false pretense, with intent to defraud, obtains from any person anything of value, or procures the execution and delivery of any instrument of writing or conveyance of real or personal property, or the signature of any person, as maker, endorser, or guarantor, to or upon any bond, bill, receipt, promissory note, draft or check, or any other evidence of indebtedness, and whoever fraudulently sells, barters, or disposes of any bond, bill, receipt, promissory note, draft or check, or other evidence of indebtedness, for value, knowing the same to be worthless, or knowing the signature of the maker, endorser, or guarantor thereof to have been obtained by any false pretense, shall if the value of the property or the sum or value of the money or property so obtained, procured, sold, bartered, or disposed of is \$200 or upward, be imprisoned not less than 1 year nor more than 3 years; or, if less than that sum, shall be fined not more than \$200 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both * * *."

SEC. 4. That section 847 of said act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 3108), is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 847. Whoever maliciously cuts down or destroys, by girdling or otherwise, any standing or growing vine, bush, shrub, sapling, or tree on the land of another, or severs from the land of another any product standing or growing thereon, or any other thing attached thereto, shall, if the value of the thing destroyed or the amount of damage done to any such thing or to the land is \$200 or more, be imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 3 years, or, if such value or amount is less than that sum, shall be fined not less than \$5 nor more than \$100, or be imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

SEC. 5. That section 848 of said act, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 403), is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 848. Whoever maliciously injures or destroys, or attempts to injure or destroy, by fire or otherwise, any movable property not his own, of the value of \$200 or more, shall be imprisoned for not less than 1 year and not more than 10 years, and if the value of the property be less than \$200 by a fine not exceeding \$200 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both."

SEC. 6. That section 851a of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 851a. Whoever shall be guilty of any offense defined in sections 834 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1202), 835 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1203), 836 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1204), 837 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1205), and 838 (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 1206) of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia shall, where

the thing, evidence of debt, property, proceeds, or profits, be of the value of less than \$200 be punished by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or a fine of not more than \$200, or both."

SEC. 7. That section 851b of said act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 851b. (D. C. Code, 1940, title 22, sec. 2203) That if any person entrusted with the possession of any thing of value, including things savoring of the realty, for the purpose of applying the same for the use and benefit of the owner or person, so delivering it, shall fraudulently convert the same to his own use he shall, where the value of the thing so converted is \$200 or more, be punished by imprisonment for not less than 1 nor more than 10 years, or by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or both; and where the value of the thing so converted is less than \$200 he shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or by a fine of not more than \$500, or both: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to alter or repeal any section contained in subchapter 2 of chapter 19 of this code."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "\$200" and insert "\$500."

Page 2, line 14, strike out section 3.

Page 3, line 10, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 3, line 22, strike out "\$100" and insert "\$500."

Page 3, line 24, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 4, line 8, strike out the second "\$200" and insert "\$500."

Page 4, line 10, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 4, line 21, strike out "\$200" and insert "\$500."

Page 4, line 22, strike out "7" and insert "6."

MR. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this is legislation to increase the jurisdiction of the municipal courts of the District of Columbia in larceny cases, raising the amount from \$50 to \$200, so that many of these small and rather petty cases will not have to be referred to the United States district court. It has been recommended by the judges of the district and municipal courts and as well by the district attorney and the corporation counsel. The bill also increases the maximum fines that may be imposed, as indicated in the committee amendments.

MR. SPEAKER, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING APPROPRIATION ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MR. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H. R. 1448, a bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902, and I ask unanimous consent that the

bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph No. 2 of section 7 of the act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," as amended by an act approved July 1, 1932, is further amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 2. No license shall be issued to any person for the operation of a business in any building or part thereof containing living or lodging quarters of any description required to be licensed under authority of this act, nor for any place of public assembly required to be licensed as hereinafter provided, nor for any other building or place mentioned in an act entitled 'An act to provide for means of egress for buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved December 24, 1942, required to be licensed as hereinafter provided or required to be licensed in any other act of Congress, until the Director of Inspection, the Chief Engineer of the Fire Department, and any other official of the District of Columbia who shall be designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, have certified in writing to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent that the applicant for license has, as to such building or place, complied with all laws enacted and regulations made and promulgated for the protection of life and property."

SEC. 2. Paragraph No. 4 of said section of said act, as amended, is further amended by inserting after the words "without the payment of a separate fee or tax for each" the words "and if a business is conducted in more than one building, a separate license shall be required for the business in each building:" so that the paragraph as amended shall read:

"PAR. 4. When more than one business, trade, profession, or calling for which a license is prescribed in this section shall be carried on by the same person, the license fee or tax shall be paid for each such business, trade, profession, or calling, except where otherwise specifically provided in this section: *Provided*, That licenses issued under any of the provisions of this section shall be good only for the location designated thereon, except in the case of licenses issued under this section for businesses and callings which in their nature are carried on at large and not at a fixed place of business, and no license shall be issued for more than one place of business, profession, or calling, without the payment of a separate fee or tax for each, and if a business is conducted in more than one building a separate license shall be required for the business in each building: *Provided further*, That no person holding a license under the terms of this section shall willfully suffer or allow any other person chargeable with a separate license to operate under his license."

SEC. 3. Strike out paragraphs Nos. 28, 29, and 30 of said section of said act, as amended, and in lieu thereof add a new paragraph to be No. 28 and to read as follows:

"PAR. 28. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to classify, according to use, method of operation, and size, buildings containing living or lodging quarters of every description, to require licenses for the business operated in each such building as in their judgment requires inspection, supervision, or regulation by any municipal agency or agencies, and to fix a schedule of license fees therefor in such

amount as, in their judgment, will be commensurate with the cost to the District of Columbia of such inspection, supervision, or regulation: *Provided, however*, That no license shall be required for single-family or two-family dwellings."

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective 60 days after its passage and approval.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the last licensing act was passed in 1903, and the Commissioners have requested the committee to modernize the present licensing system so as to get away from some difficulties which have arisen as a result of the old language as interpreted by the courts. This bill has the recommendation of the Commissioners, and it is felt it is in the interest of health and safety that the bill be passed.

Mr. Speaker, if no Member desires to discuss the bill, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] to call up bills from his subcommittee.

PROGRAM FOR THE REHABILITATION OF ALCOHOLICS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the full Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 2659) to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc.—

PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The purpose of this act is to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote temperance, and provide for the medical, psychiatric, and other scientific treatment of chronic alcoholics; to minimize the deleterious effects of excessive drinking on those who pass through the courts of the District of Columbia; to reduce the financial burden imposed upon the people of the District of Columbia by the abusive use of alcoholic beverages, as is reflected in mounting accident rates, decreased personal efficiency, growing absenteeism, and a general increase in the amount and seriousness of crime in the District of Columbia, and to substitute for jail sentences for drunkenness medical and other scientific methods of treatment which will benefit the individual involved and more fully protect the public. In order to accomplish this purpose and alleviate the problem of chronic alcoholism, the courts of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to take judicial notice of the fact that a chronic alcoholic is a sick person and in need of proper medical, institutional, advisory, and rehabilitative treatment, and the court is authorized to direct that he receive appropriate medical, psychiatric, or other treatment as provided under the terms of this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. The term "chronic alcoholic" means any person who chronically and habitually uses alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost the power of self-control with respect to the use of such beverages, or while under the influence of alcohol endangers the public morals, health, safety, or welfare.

SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to establish and equip a clinic in connection either with some existing hospital or with some correctional institution or other facility for the diagnosis, classification, hospitalization, confinement, treatment, and study of persons who are found to be chronic alcoholics, as defined herein, by the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

(b) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are also directed to utilize the alcoholic clinic services for the treatment of the chronic alcoholic as authorized by this act and for the purpose of preparing and administering a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics and the promotion of temperance through teaching and training of professional personnel and use through community organization.

SEC. 4. In any criminal case, brought to trial before any of the judges of the municipal court of the District of Columbia, in which the evidence indicates that the defendant is a chronic alcoholic within the meaning of section 2 above, the judge may after a hearing commit the person found to be a chronic alcoholic to the clinic for diagnosis, classification, and treatment as his condition may require, provided the term of commitment shall not exceed 90 days.

SEC. 5. Any court in the District of Columbia having original jurisdiction of the offenses of drunkenness and intoxication may, upon its own motion, or at the request of any police officer or any representative of the Board of Public Welfare, issue a warrant for any person who has forfeited collateral upon a third arrest for drunkenness or intoxication within any one year and may then determine whether such person is a chronic alcoholic within the meaning of this act. If the court shall find the person to be a chronic alcoholic, he may commit him generally to the clinic for a term not to exceed 90 days.

SEC. 6. (a) Any resident of the District of Columbia who is a chronic alcoholic within the meaning of this act may voluntarily submit himself for admission and treatment in the clinic. Any such voluntary applicant shall be examined by the director of the clinic under such rules and regulations as the Commissioners may approve. If he is found to be a chronic alcoholic, the Commissioners may in their discretion admit the applicant to the clinic for such period of time as is estimated by the director as necessary to effect a cure. He may be given such treatment, guidance, and help as the director deems appropriate except that he may not be committed to a correctional institution. The Commissioners may require any such chronic alcoholic voluntarily applying to pay the cost of his subsistence, care, and treatment. All such money shall be covered into the credit of the appropriation from which the expenditure was made.

(b) Any resident of the District of Columbia who voluntarily submits himself for admission and treatment in the clinic shall not forfeit or abridge thereby any of his rights as a citizen of the United States, nor shall the fact that he has submitted himself for admission and treatment or that he has been given help or has submitted himself to any study, treatment, or guidance be used against him in any proceeding in any court. The record of any application under this section by any individual for admission and treatment in the clinic and the record of any study of, or treatment, guidance, or help furnished to, any individual admitted in the

clinic under this section shall be confidential, and not be divulged. No order may be made under section 8 with respect to any such individual except as provided under the rules and regulations of the Commissioners in effect at the time such individual voluntarily submitted himself for admission and treatment in the clinic.

SEC. 7. The director of the clinic shall provide a classification and diagnostic center. Every person committed to the clinic shall first be sent to this classification and diagnostic center for observation, examination, and classification. The classification center shall make a complete study of each person committed, including mental and physical condition, personal traits, pertinent circumstances of school and family life, and any delinquency, criminal experience, or other factors contributing to his addiction to alcohol.

SEC. 8. (a) The director of the clinic may then make an order (1) permitting the chronic alcoholic to remain at liberty conditionally and under supervision, or (2) direct that he be committed to another appropriate agency, hospital, or institution for treatment, or, with the approval of the court, order him confined in a correctional institution under such conditions as the director of the clinic believes best designed for the protection of the public: *Provided*, That commitment to the clinic, an institution, hospital, or other facility shall not exceed the term specified by the court.

(b) The Attorney General of the United States may, in order to carry out the purposes of this act, designate the director of the clinic as his authorized representative under section 11 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole for the District of Columbia and to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved July 15, 1932, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 24-425).

SEC. 9. At the expiration of the term of commitment the chronic alcoholic must be discharged, unless the director of the clinic recommends to the court prior to the expiration of the term of commitment that he is in need of additional treatment in an appropriate hospital or institution, in which event the court will conduct a second hearing as to his condition, and may order the chronic alcoholic recommitted for an additional period of 90 days or less as his condition requires.

SEC. 10. A chronic alcoholic committed to the clinic and who is permitted to remain at liberty or conditionally released shall be under the supervision of the probation office of the court in which he was sentenced, or the clinic, or such other agency, public or private, as the director of the clinic may determine.

SEC. 11. No chronic alcoholic shall be committed under the terms of this act until the District Commissioner shall certify to the municipal court of the District of Columbia the extent to which proper and adequate treatment facilities and personnel have been provided to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 12. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia may contract with any appropriate agency not under its control for the custody, care, subsistence, treatment, and training of persons committed to the alcoholic clinic herein authorized.

SEC. 13. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to appoint a director of the clinic, who shall be a qualified medical man, the necessary medical officers, psychiatrists, probation officers, social-case workers, and other personnel needed to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 14. The director of the clinic shall from time to time submit to the Commissioners such recommendations as will further the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics, prevent the excessive and abusive use of alcoholic beverages, promote temperance, and

he shall also gather and publish as complete and accurate data as is possible relating to the physiological, psychological, economic, and social effects of the abusive use of alcoholic beverages and shall prepare and publish materials, data, and information to be used in a program of public education in the District of Columbia directed toward the prevention and use of alcoholic beverages excessively and abusively.

Sec. 15. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 for the fiscal year 1948 and thereafter such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Section 3 (a), page 3, line 7: Strike out "the municipal", insert the word "any" before the word "court."

Section 4, page 3, line 17: Strike out the words "the municipal", insert the word "any" before the word "court."

Section 6 (b), page 5, line 13: After the word "divulged", insert "except on order of the court."

Section 8 (a), page 6, lines 3 and 4: Strike out the words "an order", insert in place thereof the words "a recommendation to the committing judge."

Section 8 (a), page 6, line 5: Change the word "direct" to "directing."

Section 8 (a), page 6, beginning on line 7, strike out "with the approval of the court, order him confined in a correctional institution under such conditions as the director of the clinic believes best designed for the protection of the public: *Provided*, That commitment to the clinic, an institution, hospital, or other facility shall not exceed the term specified by the court" and insert in place thereof the following: "(3) directing that he be confined in a correctional institution, and the court may then determine the conditions under which a chronic alcoholic shall be committed and order such commitment."

Section 10, page 7, line 8: Strike out the word "sentenced" and insert in place thereof the word "committed."

Section 10, page 7, line 9: Strike out the words "director of the clinic" and insert in place thereof the word "court."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, the bill is one that sets up a rehabilitation program for chronic alcoholics in the District of Columbia and provides for their scientific and medical treatment when so designated by the court. It might be of interest to the Members of the House to know that in 12 years' time there have been 318,000 arrests in the District. In 1946 there were 30,321 arrests. There are a great many arrests for alcoholism. The police in the District of Columbia have done a very fine job of keeping the staggering drunks off the streets and out of public view. However, many of these people who are intoxicated are brought to the court and sent to the workhouse where they have a daily average of about 550 people all there for drunkenness. Many of them have been sentenced 10 to 20 times in a few years. Sixty percent are repeaters and they are turned out after serving a mild sentence and no effort is made to treat them. The chairman of the committee that had this matter under consideration in the Seventy-ninth Congress appointed a committee to make a study of this problem. The personnel of the committee was Repre-

sentative Hébert, of Louisiana; Judge Laws, chief justice of the district court in the District of Columbia; Mr. Bennett, of the Bureau of Prisons; Mr. Morse, chairman of the Board of Public Welfare; and Vernon West, corporation counsel. This group did make a very careful study of the problem. They brought in a bill which the committee feels ought to be adopted for the benefit of the District of Columbia.

This bill presents new legislation and a new approach to the problem of alcoholism. I think it will probably be the means of saving the District some money. It is estimated that these 137,000 who have been in jail in the last 10 years have cost the District between five and eight million dollars.

This bill sets up a clinic for the treating of chronic alcoholics. It is under the supervision of the Commissioners, and it has not only their approval but is given the green light by the industry. It provides for the scientific treatment of these chronic alcoholics. They can be assigned to the clinic when in the judgment of the court that is where they belong and then through scientific approaches try to cut down the number of individuals who might otherwise be sent to jail. There were 2,750 alcoholics at Gallinger Hospital in 1943. This last year there were 4,000. Many of those alcoholics are there because of excessive use of hard liquor. The best medical opinion before our committee was to the effect that from 30 to 50 percent of the chronic alcoholics could be helped. We feel that this bill is one which will be a step forward in an attempt to rehabilitate some of the chronic alcoholics of the District of Columbia. The bill calls for an appropriation of \$100,000 from the general fund. When the clinic is fully established more money will be needed. It will be money well spent. The committee feels that in the end money will be saved, society will be benefited, and a forward step taken to do something definite about treating these chronic alcoholics, who are really sick individuals. Jail is not the answer to their trouble. We think they are sick people and need scientific and technical attention of psychiatrists and medical personnel. This will be done under the supervision of a qualified medical director in the clinic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am very strongly in favor of this bill. I think it a marked step forward. I think other States in the United States are coming to a realization that the way to meet this issue is through clinics. I hope this bill will be passed.

However, I do want to say this, that I think it unfortunate, when this bill did go through the committee, that the cost of maintaining the clinics was not provided for by deriving the money from the industry which creates the necessity for the clinics.

Here is a great opportunity in the District of Columbia to prove the advisability of that method of payment for these clinics. An effort is being made in Cali-

fornia today to secure the cost of the clinics from that source. It has already been done in the State of Connecticut with marked success. It was proposed but not passed by the Legislature of Massachusetts, all of which are indications that the thinking of the people is that the cost of the clinics should be laid directly upon the industry which creates the necessity.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield gladly to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I wish to say to the gentleman that I agree wholeheartedly in what he has said in connection with the taxation feature, but after extensive hearings it was decided that the best way to get the bill passed at this time was to change that particular section of the original bill and draw the funds out of the general fund. The original bill contained a section directly taxing the industry, the place from which I think the money should come.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. As I say, as far as I know, Connecticut is the only State so far that has actually done it, but it has been done there very successfully and other States will follow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENIORITY BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 1997) to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia whose name appeared (as a result of a regular competitive examination for promotion) on any civil-service register with respect to such force or department for promotion to a higher rank or grade, while he was serving in the armed forces of the United States during the period beginning May 1, 1940, and ending December 31, 1946, shall, for the purpose of determining his seniority rights and service in such rank or grade, be held to have been promoted to such rank or grade as of the earliest date on which an eligible standing lower on the same promotion register received a promotion, to such rank or grade.

(b) No officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to the benefits of this section who has re-enlisted after June 1, 1945, in the Regular Military Establishment or after February 1, 1945, in the Regular Naval Establishment.

SEC. 2. No officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall, by reason of the enactment of this act, be (1) reduced in rank or grade, or (2) entitled to any compensation for any period prior to the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, the title of the bill explains the bill. This merely gives those members of the police force who are veterans of World War II the right to retain and maintain their seniority when they return from the service.

The bill has been approved by the District Commissioners, by the Chief of the Police Department, and the Chief of the Fire Department, with the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "promotion", insert "either permanently or temporarily."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF STONE PIERS ON WEST EXECUTIVE AVENUE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Director of the National Park Service is hereby authorized and directed to remove the stone piers from West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no controversy about the bill. It simply directs the removal of two stone piers which are traffic hazards in West Executive Avenue.

The bill has the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker that concludes the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia for today.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, as I have had the pleasure of saying before in this well, Alabama is proud of the splendid work of the able Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of Alabama, the Honorable PETE JARMAN.

Particularly has his service been outstanding as a member of our great Committee on Foreign Affairs. In that field one of his notable contributions has been to the cause of the good-neighbor policy that has meant and is meaning so much toward the establishment of friendship in the Americas.

It gives me great pleasure therefore, on this Pan-American Day, to call the attention of those of us who may not have been privileged to hear it, to Mr. JARMAN's address to the Club de las Americas, delivered in the auditorium of the Department of the Interior in Washington, on March 13, 1947:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, first, I wish to heartily congratulate each member of this excellent club on your fine interest in pan-American affairs and in the study of Spanish. Just as these affairs will remain all important so, in my opinion, will Spanish be the most valuable foreign language for citizens of the United States in the future.

It is pleasing to note that you have designated this night as The Night of the United States and I appreciate very much the privilege you very kindly afford me of participating therein. This is particularly true since you have dedicated it to the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary. Having long been rather active in the former, my local post of which did me the honor of electing me its original commander at its organization meeting while I was still in France, and having enjoyed the privilege of serving as department commander of Alabama and in other official capacities, I yield to no man in my loyalty to the Legion and to the principles for which it stands, and I am always happy to be associated with Legionnaires and their ladies under any circumstances. My attitude toward pan-Americanism and the good-neighbor policy is a very similar one.

You Spanish speakers are particularly aware that Pan-American Day has become a very significant anniversary. Commemorating the political, economic and spiritual unity of the Americas, based on the doctrine of absolute juridical equality and respect for the sovereignty of each, it has become a powerful influence in bringing about closer understanding among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. It is the one day set aside by the governments of an entire continent to symbolize their common bond and their common hope for a system of international relations based on mutual respect and cooperation.

In 1944 the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile invited the Speaker or President and one other member of similar bodies in the other Americas to attend the celebration of this day by his group. It was my good fortune to have been selected, together with Hon. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, now the ranking majority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, who succeeded me recently as Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee thereof, for this mission. It afforded me much pleasure to speak for our country on that festive occasion, my one regret having been my lack of knowledge of Spanish which necessitated the translation of my speech.

It was agreed at a conference on the following day that we would request ratifica-

tion by our various bodies of the creation of an American Interparliamentary Congress to promote a movement of continental unity on the parliamentary level. The resolution included the setting up of a permanent commission consisting of the senior delegates from the countries represented. Our House of Representatives readily and unanimously ratified the creation of this commission and I am confident that it will prove quite fruitful during the years to come even though the circumstances have prevented it being very active as yet.

In 1906, at the third American Conference at Rio de Janeiro, Elihu Root said:

"There is not one of all of our countries that cannot benefit the others; there is not one that cannot receive benefit from the others; there is not one that will not gain by the prosperity, the peace and the happiness of all."

Thirty years later, President Roosevelt said at another Pan-American Conference at the same place:

"The interdependence of nations is the major premise upon which the whole system of inter-American relations is based. No nation can live entirely alone. No people is sufficient unto itself."

In proclaiming Pan-American Day in 1945 Mayor Burke, of Cleveland, very appropriately said:

"Nature has made us neighbors. Let good will and cooperation make us good neighbors."

There are so many reasons in addition to those of geography, for the solidarity of the Americas and the good-neighbor policy, that it is rather difficult to select from among them. However, it occurs to me to mention the reciprocal character of their economies and the close parallel of their political evolutions. As you well know, they were at one time colonies of European states. The basis of the revolutions which caused their independence was practically the same. They were based on the dissatisfaction of the peoples of the colonies with the economic, political and intellectual restrictions of the mother countries.

There is no one of the American countries which produces everything it needs, but the Americas produce practically everything they all need. Stated in another way, there is no American country that is self-sufficient, whereas the American continent is practically so. To illustrate, where would we have been during the recent war—I mean the United States—but for the magnificent cooperation of our sister American Republics? Where without the tin of Bolivia? Where without the cooper of Chile and Peru? Where without the quinine of Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia? And where without those bases and that life-line down through Brazil when we entered Africa, to say nothing of the magnificent Brazilian Expeditionary Force which so long and so valiantly fought as a part of General Clark's army in Italy and those excellent Mexican aviators? These are but illustrations of the great contributions made by the Americas to the war effort. In addition, we of the United States will, of course, never forget the speedy declarations of war by so many of our good neighbors. It will be recalled that little Costa Rica declared war several hours before we did with the statement that an aggression against any American country was one against them all.

The degree of economic development in each of the Americas is, of course, different, some having developed to a much greater extent than others. That will continue. What it behooves us all to do is to see that the development of all the Americas continues apace until at least something like full advantage of the fine possibilities of each one of these great countries is taken. While all countries must, and I am sure will, do their parts, I am impressed that it is the duty of the United States to continue its

leadership in fostering this development, not only within our boundaries, but throughout the hemisphere.

With that background it is not at all unnatural that the statesmen of the Americas have been pan-American minded. It was quite natural for President Monroe when promulgating the Monroe Doctrine in 1823 to have been thinking of the interests of the other American countries even though he naturally had first in mind the welfare of his own. It was equally so for the activities of the liberator Simón Bolívar to have spread throughout South America and not be confined to his native Venezuela. In fact, it spread much further as illustrated by the identity of the great American soldier, who was in command of the Tenth Army practically throughout its conquest of Okinawa until a Jap shell laid him low only a few days before final and complete victory. I refer to that outstanding American lieutenant general, Simon Bolívar Buckner, Jr., whose father was named for the great liberator.

The American system of international relations had its foundation more than 100 years ago. It took more tangible form more than 50 years ago and at the 1945 Conference on the Problems of War and Peace at Mexico City it reached a degree of development which is outstanding in the history of the world. Let us hope, believe, and reverently pray that it will continue so. Despite the existence of pan-Americanism and its comparatively slow progress for more than a hundred years, it remained for the leadership of two great citizens of the United States to sufficiently accelerate the movement to bring about the possibility of such development. I, of course, refer to our lamented President Roosevelt and that great Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Very shortly after having entered office in 1933 they formulated the good-neighbor policy, the greatest step toward good relations between the Americas that ever has occurred or can ever occur. Furthermore, who can deny the possibility that it will in time be reflected upon as one of the greatest contributions toward permanent peace? Senator Austin, our able delegate to the United Nations said Saturday: "The world security for which the United Nations is striving rests on the oaken beam of Western Hemisphere solidarity."

I am aware that some think too little attention has been paid since the advent of the United Nations, the Charter of which specifically provides for such regional systems, to pan-Americanism. While it is natural for all to have been thoroughly engrossed in an effort to preserve civilization by making the United Nations succeed, I do not believe either the statesmen or the general population of the Americas have overlooked its importance, or will permit the success of any effort to divide and conquer.

One of the first implementations, and a very productive one, of the good-neighbor policy, was the withdrawal of the Marines from Haiti under the provision thereof that henceforth no American republic would interfere with the internal affairs of another.

I am reminded of an interesting experience. When the boat on which I was proceeding to Panama docked for several hours at Port-au-Prince, in August 1939 we immediately learned that they were celebrating a national holiday and were at first somewhat disappointed that the stores would be closed. This disappointment was soon allayed, however, by the realization that, though we would not become acquainted with the shops, we were seeing practically the entire population in the streets. Were they celebrating their original liberation from the French? Were they celebrating their second liberation from that country? Was it a celebration of the conclusion of one of their numerous conflicts with their neigh-

bors on the same island? No; they were celebrating the day on which the United States Marines were withdrawn.

There was a time when it was well nigh impossible for the good-neighbor policy to function as it now can, since the people of the Americas could not know each other very well because of the great distances, the sparseness of the population of many, in fact most, of the countries and the difficulties of transportation. Fortunately that defect has been very largely remedied by the radio and airplane. I learned of Secretary Knox's death by a radio announcement at Arequipa, Peru. We know much more of each other now, even if we never visit one of our neighboring American Republics, than we could possibly have known before. These developments of science can but contribute much toward the continued progress of, and improvement in, pan-Americanism and the good-neighbor policy.

It is most interesting to trace developments of the pan-American concept from the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine, to the Act of Chapultepec. I referred to the fact that the Monroe Doctrine was a proclamation of a President of the United States which said to the rest of the world in behalf of his country alone, "Hands off of this hemisphere. Posted. There will be no more colonization. If you have any idea, you of countries who had had colonies over here and have lost them, of regaining them, you had just as well forget it, because you will not do so." This policy so remained for years. In the conference at Habana, however, in 1940, just after France fell, when we of the Americas probably first realized the great danger which confronted us, the other American Republics joined with the United States in saying to the world, "Hands off of this hemisphere. Any aggression by you against one of the American countries will be considered by the others as an aggression against us all. You shall not pass."

Then in 1945 came the Mexico City Conference, which resulted in the all-important Act of Chapultepec. This act, you will recall, extends the Monroe Doctrine and the Habana Conference resolution so that every American Republic now guarantees every other one against aggression from within as well as from without this hemisphere. In briefly discussing it on the floor of the House shortly after having read of it, I hailed the Act of Chapultepec as a new Monroe Doctrine, as a new good-neighbor policy, and, mark this, I referred to it as probably a forerunner of things to come. This was shortly before the convening of the San Francisco Conference and I had in mind the hope that this action of the American Republics, which I felt quite confident would forever banish war from this hemisphere, would be followed at San Francisco by similar action on the part of all the peoples of the world. We were aware then that the civilization we know could not survive another war and that it was, therefore, imperative that the leadership of the world do whatever is necessary to prevent one. I hoped then, and still hope and believe, that this was the first step. If this hope materializes, which, or something like it, must occur if civilization is to survive, pan-Americanism and the good-neighbor policy will go down in history as having been most instrumental in the preservation of permanent peace, not only in this hemisphere, but throughout the world. In this event, all other practical aspects and benefits of this policy will fade into insignificance in comparison with its influence on this great accomplishment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM TODAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, we celebrate today Pan-American Day to commemorate the date in 1890 when the Pan American Union was first created. We do honor today to our 20 sister republics of the Americas, republics which have gained their freedom through that same exaltation of the spirit shown by us in 1776; republics which by much sacrifice have adhered to their original principles of freedom throughout their histories. Truly all of us in the United States and in the 20 other American Republics may take pride in calling ourselves American. It should be made clear once and for all that this word is equally applicable to every citizen of every American Republic.

It is interesting to recall that it was a Republican Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, who issued the call for the first conference in 1889. But great as was the contribution of Secretary Blaine and President Arthur, the idea of a common interest among the nations of the Americas came from the great patriot and liberator Simon Bolívar, who proposed the First Congress of Plenipotentiaries from all American Nations in 1826. The Pan American Union itself truly states that Pan-American Day "is the only day set aside by the governments of an entire continent to symbolize our common bonds and common hopes for a system of international relations based on mutual respect and cooperation." The President of the United States has proclaimed this week to be Pan-American Week and that proclamation refers to the "inter-American system which has developed around the Pan American Union."

On such a day as this it is fitting that we should reexamine the foundations of the inter-American system, the glorious history upon which it is based, and the goals toward which we shall move together in the days to come. All of us here, regardless of party, are faithfully devoted to the good-neighbor policy, the Montevideo policy of nonintervention on which it is based, and the strengthening of our ties with our sister republics. Such a policy involves first, freedom from interference in and the highest respect for the internal management and affairs of each of the American Republics; and, second, a correlative obligation to consult with and to work with each other in the interests which concern us collectively without selfishness and without dictation. It involves, too, a willingness by some to defer to the judgment of others even though they may disagree, in order to advance the cause of all. Elihu Root, another great Secretary of State, said at the Pan-American Conference in 1906:

We neither claim nor desire any rights, or privileges, or powers that we do not freely concede to every American Republic.

The inter-American system has had splendid fruition in the programs for inter-American cultural and educational exchange, in the reciprocal trade program, in the international conferences of the American states, and in many specialized fields—in medicine, law, science, religion, labor and civil rights.

It is especially timely now to appraise our common future in view of the post-war strains and pressures which are beginning to show up. It is becoming clear that our kind of constitutional democracy which is based on individual freedom, is being challenged as never before by a form of society which considers it desirable to subordinate individual human rights and democratic processes to attain what is claimed to be a better and more secure economic system. Not only is this thesis, which is broadly the Communist thesis, being propagated overseas but it is being propagated right here in the Americas. An outstanding leader of the Communist party in Brazil is authority for the statement that there is a hard core of militant members of Communist parties totalling about 390,000 in the other American republics; that of these, 130,000 are in Brazil, 50,000 are in Chile, 150,000 are in Cuba, 25,000 are in Mexico and 35,000 are in Argentina. The voting strength of these parties is politically more significant than their membership would indicate. In the Presidential elections of December 1945, in Brazil the Communist party claiming a membership of 130,000 actually polled 586,000 votes or about 10 percent of the total cast. In Chile with a claimed membership of only 50,000, the Communist party polled about 9 percent of the votes cast in the Presidential election in 1946, but provided the critical total needed by the Presidential candidate of one of the older parties and obtained 3 posts in the 11 man cabinet of the President. We have had other experiences with totalitarian ideologies in the other American republics, and we are probably not yet through with those either. Relentless investigation, diplomatic action and the white light of publicity did much to lessen the threat to our security of Nazi and Fascist penetration in the other American republics—a penetration powerful in economic, social and political circles, though not as strong in numbers. But the same technique does not suit every ism nor is the issue always timed the same.

The activities in the Americas of the indigenous Communist Parties may not constitute an imminent threat to our security; nor do I believe that this movement can be dealt with by force or repression. I believe rather that Communists in this hemisphere represent in the American Republics a new influence to be taken seriously as resulting from low standards of living and semifuedal economies in many countries; which seem hardly credible when found so close to our own borders by thousands of our citizens who work in or visit the other American Republics. For example, the life expectancy of the average citizen of the United States is 65 years; the life expectancy of the average Mexican is 34, and of the average Brazilian 43 years. The reasons for this are not organic but are found in undernourishment, bad housing, bad sanitation, and inadequate medical care. In Brazil, for example, malaria is a major disease occurring in millions of cases and causing 35 percent of the total deaths every year, whereas in the United States deaths from malaria are very rare and the disease is well under control. In the United States we

have 1 doctor for every 700 inhabitants and in Brazil they have 1 for every 2,000; then, too, although 3 hospital beds per 1,000 population is considered an absolute minimum, we find in a country like Colombia exactly one-half of that. Infant mortality shows the same pattern. In the United States infant mortality averages 40 per 1,000 live births; in Brazil the comparable figure is almost five times as great—185; and in Colombia it is 154. That these problems essentially have an economic base is clear when we consider the per capita incomes in the other American Republics as compared with our own. According to the latest figures, our own per capita income has climbed to approximately \$1,150 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. This compares with a per capita income in Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Peru, and practically every other Central and South American country, except Uruguay and Argentina, of under \$100 per person, or less than one-tenth the United States figure.

We are at present engaged in the consideration of a vast program for economic and other aid to Greece and Turkey designed to fortify the national integrity of these countries and to prevent their collapse as independent and democratic states. We know that this may well be the forerunner of obligations of the same general character to be undertaken in other parts of the Middle East, Europe, and in Asia, and possibly in Africa. If the areas of vital interest to us include Thessaly and the Black Sea, they certainly include the Caribbean, the South Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, and yet we countenance right here in our own back yard the continued existence of economic conditions which lend strength and support to a system of society we consider to be antithetical in every respect to our own—we seem to be quite unmindful of the fact that the Communist ideology is gaining, not losing, ground throughout the other American republics. Here more clearly than anywhere else in the world the answer is dictated by basic facts we know so well—low standards of living, leading to despair, leading to the refuge of despair which is communism.

Linked closely with insufficient income in producing low standards of living is the illiteracy of large masses of the population of the other American republics. Here, too, there are enormous advances to be made. Compared with a literacy of 96 percent of the population in the United States, literacy in most of the other American republics averages about 50 percent of the population, rising to a high of 85-90 percent in Argentina and falling to lows in the 30-percent bracket in other countries.

During the recent war a great effort was made by United States agencies, in full cooperation with and on the invitation of most of the other American republics, for the improvement of their standards of living, standards of education, and standards of health. It is estimated that the United States spent \$76,000,000 on these programs from 1942 to 1946. For example, \$16,000,000 were spent by the United States in cooperative health and sanitation programs alone,

and millions of citizens of the other American republics were benefited in this way. Large contributions were made by the other American republics toward this program. In Bolivia contributions were about equal between the United States and Bolivian Governments; Mexico contributed 40 percent of the total cost, and in every case the Government benefited made substantial contributions. In Brazil alone 370 health centers were established. But these programs are gradually terminating—most of them in 1948—and what shall succeed them? In most cases it is doubtful that the health and sanitation programs can be carried on with local resources and local technical personnel; practically every participating government invites the United States to continue its interest and the program on a long-term basis and until higher standards are achieved and given permanence. Another example is the Inter-American Highway, now well along but still needing \$65,000,000 and 4 years' work to become a complete connecting link. This does not mean that we should go on forever supporting such operations, but it does mean that we should go on until they can or reasonably should be able to stand on their own feet.

In the field of education the same is true. Our educational missions in Peru, Chile, Haiti, Costa Rica, Honduras, Brazil, and other countries will be pulling out in about 1948, unless they are extended. They have had enormous effect in raising the level of education, vocational training, and normal-school training, and in supplying competent instruction through teacher-training programs in all of these countries. It is very clear that practically everywhere the job is just about started—not even well started—as in most cases the program has been for 2 or 3 years while what is needed is a 10-year program. The governments concerned want us to go on, yet, the war being over, they are afraid that our interest in them will lag, just as it did after World War I, and that we will not think of them in terms of mutual helpfulness again until another crisis comes upon us.

I wish to make it clear at this point that the other American republics have not been the recipients of favors from us in respect to these programs but have been full partners, cooperating in every way, including their money contributions.

Together we have recognized the fact that improvement of the health, sanitation, education, and living standards of all Americans in the Western Hemisphere is of equal importance to the security and well-being of every country in the hemisphere.

To those who say that these programs take large sums of money, let it be made clear at once that World War II cost us \$100,000,000 per year, and that when the attack came at Pearl Harbor it was to the other American republics we looked first—their friendship, their loyalty to the common cause assured us at once that we were safe in our own homes. From that point on we could mobilize our resources freely and go on to win. Continuance of our program in the other American republics on the basis of full

and continuing cooperation with them should not cost us more than about a hundred million dollars a year—one-fourth of the Greek-Turkish assistance program for 15 months. The results of our own security, in the successful demonstration in this hemisphere that our form of society is the best on earth and in the general happiness of living with neighbors who also are healthy and prosperous and well educated, will repay any such investment many times over—and this is quite apart from the very tangible benefits in trade which would flow from a prosperous, literate, and healthy Latin America.

Few of us recognize the size of the markets to the south of us and what they mean to us in terms of trade. In a normal year like 1939, 9.6 percent of our total exports, equaling \$329,127,000, and 13.7 percent of our total imports, totaling \$317,267,000, were with the other American Republics; while in the first 8 months of 1946 we shipped \$94,000,000 of goods to Argentina alone. For their development the other American Republics need our agricultural and industrial machinery, power, transportation, and commercial equipment, chemicals, paper products, and many other items. We, in turn, need their raw materials, mineral and oil resources. There is, too, the opportunity for an enormous trade among the other American Republics, such as that now growing between Brazil and her neighbors in cotton textiles. Progress in industrialization within the other American Republics will materially raise their standards of living and per capita income. It will go far toward creating a middle class—now practically nonexistent in the other American Republics—and yet in every democratic country the bulwark of democracy and individual freedom.

Money alone will not do our job in the Americas, but technical help—engineers, doctors, dentists, sanitation experts, metallurgists, factory managers, business supervisors, and a host of other specialists—are necessary. These men should be trained especially for the purpose of working in the other American Republics and should consider themselves as soldiers of democracy, and not just as workmen. For this purpose a great training organization in the United States is essential. The possibility of having citizens of the other American Republics study in the United States and learn our techniques for use in their own countries has not begun to be adequately utilized, nor have cultural and educational exchanges taken place on nearly the scale essential to the common destiny of the Americas.

Much oratory has been lavished and much discussion stimulated by the failure so far to undertake the final implementation of the Act of Chapultepec of February 1945 in negotiating a hemisphere defense treaty among the American republics. Such a treaty is essential to the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere and fits into the structure of the United Nations Charter, which was designed to accommodate it. It should be effectuated as soon as possible. An essential element, however, in the negotiation of such a treaty lies in the need

for joining together American nations whose internal economies and well-being is more nearly approaching comparability than is the case now among the other American republics and the United States. To enter into such a treaty in any other context would be to endeavor to build upon sand a concrete structure of hemispheric security, and possibly to contribute within each of the other American republics to a continuance of the economic status quo. The final negotiation of the hemisphere defense treaty designed at Chapultepec should go hand in hand with an Inter-American Conference for Economic and Cultural Cooperation and the reorientation of the United States inter-American program of World War II to the peacetime needs of the other American republics. Then we would have no need to fear totalitarian ideologies in the Western Hemisphere and we could march together with our brothers of the other American republics toward our common destiny of peace culture and prosperity.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PERMANENT BUILDINGS ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the colleges and universities of America face a crisis. GI enrollments throughout the land have soared to unprecedented levels. The educational institutions acknowledge that their buildings are woefully inadequate. For at least 5 years they shall be confronted with the need for additional buildings.

There were 100,000 more veterans in colleges and universities this past February than there were last September. At least another 100,000—and probably more—will be enrolled by next September.

But all this, I am sure you will agree, is exactly as it should be. A grateful nation is fulfilling a promise to its young men and young women who left their classrooms to serve their country. Many times over have they earned the right to a college education.

I doubt if there is a Member of Congress who would want us to go back on our word. Yet, gentlemen, unless action is taken, that will be the result.

A few days ago I introduced legislation which would provide grants-in-aid for construction of permanent buildings on college and university campuses. H. R. 2845 is not a general-aid bill for higher education; it is a tool which Congress must have to carry out its responsibilities under Public Law 16 and Public Law 346, the so-called GI bills.

Educational institutions of college grade have done their part to meet the challenge Congress gave them in passing veterans' legislation. They have increased their capacity more than one-third above that of 1939 and 1940. Meanwhile, their enrollments have doubled and tripled.

I am sure that each of you is fully aware of what is happening in the col-

leges and universities within your own districts. The facts show that the situation is peculiar to no one district. It is peculiar to no single State. We are facing a problem which is national in scope.

Housing is congested. There is also a real shortage now in classrooms, study halls, infirmaries, libraries, and other buildings. These, as well as dormitories, are essential. An academic plant can no more operate without them than an automobile can run without a motor.

We have already added temporary facilities, both housing and nonhousing, on many campuses. The institutions have matched the Federal expenditures almost dollar for dollar. It was the only way to provide buildings during the lean period of critical materials. Now, however, permanent building materials can be acquired.

I have been advised that the temporary buildings cost five-eighths as much as permanent structures. That is why I am opposed to putting any large amount of additional funds into temporary classrooms, libraries, and other buildings. I have never believed in buying shoes with paper soles for \$5 when a pair made of leather could be bought for \$8. It looks like poor economy to me, both for the colleges and for the Congress.

The measure which I have introduced has safeguards to make certain that it would not establish a permanent policy.

No grant-in-aid would be approved unless the need were certified by the Office of Education as resulting from veterans' enrollment. Construction must get underway by December 31, 1948, and the buildings must be completed in time to be of service to veterans. No grant-in-aid may exceed 50 percent of the cost of the building.

I have reason to believe that this bill will have the strong support not only of the colleges and universities but also of veterans' organizations. They share the belief that there should be adequate facilities for veterans to pursue the educational courses which their Government promised.

They need our help. They need it now. I strongly urge consideration of H. R. 2845 without delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record with regard to Hon. D. Emmert Brumbaugh, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter he received.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and to include in each a newspaper article.

RABBI ALEXANDER D. GOODE INTERDENOMINATIONAL MEMORIAL CHAPEL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish communities of York, Hanover, and Gettysburg in my congressional district

are responsible for some noteworthy work which is deserving of recognition.

I am referring to the \$15,000 interdenominational chapel which has been presented to the new Boy Scout camp near Dillsburg, Pa. Announcement of the presentation was made recently by Attorney Horace G. Ports, president of the York-Adams area council.

This chapel will commemorate the heroism of Rabbi Alexander V. Goode, onetime Scout committeeman for troop 37, and the three other chaplains who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the transport *Dorchester* off Greenland in February 1943. The other chaplains were the Reverend John P. Washington, Catholic; the Reverend Clark V. Poling and the Reverend George L. Fox, Protestants.

In making the announcement, Mr. Ports revealed that the chairman of the chapel fund campaign, Mr. Mose Leibowitz, prominent York merchant, had reported 91 percent of the fund-raising drive completed with \$12,975 contributed by 675 individuals. Children ranging in age from 4 to 12 accounted for \$400 in contributions.

Serving on the Goode Memorial Chapel committee are: Sidney Bernstein, Ben Sevel, Philip Bernstein, Rabbi M. N. Friedman, Rabbi Leonard Rothstein, Arthur Markowitz, Louis Hollander, A. D. Cohen, Oscar Kranich, E. A. Freedman, Maurice Lavetan, Bernard Zuckerman, Morton Kagen, Louis Mavetan, Mose Leibowitz, Joseph Lehman, Joseph Sperling, Ben Lavetan, and Ben Landi, all of York; Nat Ginsburg and Jerome Sherman, Hanover; and Irving Bierer, of Gettysburg.

The chapel project, undertaken by the Jewish community, is only one part of the general fund-raising campaign for the new camp by the York-Adams council. The chapel will be built on the new camp site as soon as materials become available. The proposed chapel has a main edifice 92 feet in length and 42 feet in width, with meditation wings connected by cloisters, each being 16 feet by 24 feet. The chapel will be of log and native wood construction, with concrete and flagstone floors. The outdoor assembly will be built on an inclined surface rising away from the sanctuary to form an amphitheater. The chapel will contain offices, studies and vessel and vestment storage rooms.

Services may be conducted in the interior if weather should not permit outdoor services. Both the auditorium and the outdoor amphitheater will seat 300. Separate services may be held in each section at the same time, without interfering with the other. The altar may be revolved to face either an inside or outside service. The sides of the sanctuary being on hinges, this area may be closed off if desired. Although designed as a place of worship for all faiths, the enclosed pavilion may be used for entertainments or as a workshop.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts of these gentlemen in behalf of the Goode Memorial Chapel to be erected for the Boy Scouts is a fine example of community spirit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS AND THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Preparatory Committee set up by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations convened in Geneva to lay the foundations for multilateral expansion of international trade. Under Secretary of State Will Clayton and his staff are conferring with representatives of 18 other countries in an effort to do two things: First, to conclude preparations for an International Conference on World Trade and Employment and drafting of a charter for an International Trade Organization, along the lines proposed by the United States Government in November 1945; second, to undertake to negotiate with these other countries, who will also negotiate with each other, trade agreements providing for the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers and for the substantial elimination of trade discriminations. These are the purposes outlined by Mr. Clayton before the Committee on Ways and Means prior to departure for Geneva.

Now, you might wonder, Mr. Speaker, why the Under Secretary of State, busy as he must have been preparing for the Geneva meeting, should have to appear on three successive days before our committee. Nothing was said that was not already common knowledge. The operation of the trade-agreements program has been publicly aired during the congressional consideration of four successive extensions of the reciprocal trade program. The draft of a charter of the International Trade Organization has been publicized and hearings have been held in selected cities from coast to coast to enable interested parties to present their views.

So why detain Mr. Clayton? And why are we having the current hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means on the reciprocal trade program? Since the committee is not considering specific legislation, we can only conclude that their intention is to snipe at Mr. Clayton's efforts at Geneva. This conclusion is supported, Mr. Speaker, by the flood of propaganda that is being released upon the Committee on Ways and Means and the Congress, and by some of the slanted statements, many of them wholly in error, being made in the House by a few Members of the majority.

To set the record straight then, let us analyze first the figures on foreign trade with specified countries inserted by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1947, at page A1370. The heading of this insertion reads:

America's share in the total out-of-country purchases of all the principal trading nations of the world grows smaller under the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program. Instead of expanding it, our foreign trade is now threatened with extinction.

How utterly misleading and inaccurate this heading is we shall see in a moment.

There is an impressive-appearing tabulation. It is impressive in the sense that the number of years and the results which the author desired to show are uniform. When this table is casually

analyzed it is found that it completely misses the mark intended.

In the first place this table was presented to show that the results of the trade-agreements program has been unfavorable. Of the 13 countries shown in the table, 4 were nonagreement countries, 3 of which were Germany, Italy, and Japan, our recent enemies in World War II, and which did not believe in our type of reciprocity and conducted trade warfare against the system; the fourth was the small country of Denmark. With respect to two others, the United Kingdom and Argentina, not a single trade-agreement year was shown in the figures; the agreement with the United Kingdom went into effect January 1, 1939, while Mr. GEARHART's figures ended with 1938; the agreement with Argentina went into effect in 1941 and the last figure he used was also 1938; so that nearly half of the countries, 6 out of 13, must automatically be eliminated as outside of the trade-agreements program for the period given.

That legitimately leaves in the list France, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden, Switzerland, and Brazil where the trade agreements might have had direct effect on the commerce with the respective countries.

Far different results are shown with respect to the trade of these countries when pertinent years are given and not concealed by tricky averages made of agreement and nonagreement years jumbled together. Take, for example, 1929, the last full year before the Hawley-Smoot Act went into effect and 1933, the resulting depression low and the last full year before there was any trade agreement, and 1938, the last year used by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], we get the following encouraging results:

Percent of imports from the United States	
	Percent
France:	
1929.....	12.3
1933.....	10.3
1938 ¹	11.4
Canada:	
1929.....	68.5
1933.....	54.1
1938 ²	62.6
Netherlands:	
1929.....	9.8
1933.....	6.4
1938 ³	10.8
Belgium:	
1929.....	9.5
1933.....	9.3
1938 ⁴	11.0
Sweden:	
1929.....	14.6
1933.....	10.2
1938 ⁵	16.2
Switzerland:	
1929.....	8.9
1933.....	5.8
1938 ⁶	7.8
Brazil:	
1929.....	30.1
1933.....	21.1
1938 ⁷	24.2

¹ 1.1 points increase over the Hawley-Smoot year, 1933.

² 8.5 points increase over the Hawley-Smoot year, 1933.

³ An increase above banner year, 1929.

⁴ 2.0 points increase over the Hawley-Smoot year, 1933.

⁵ 3.1 points increase over Hawley-Smoot year, 1933.

It will be noted that with respect to the Netherlands, Belgium, and Sweden, the percent of imports from the United States was above the alleged prosperity year of 1929. Those who worship at the shrine of 1929 prosperity should not forget so soon the calamitous consequences in 1933 and 1939—the greatest depression and the most horrible war the world has ever known—and all directly related to the Hawley-Smoot economic isolationism of the Tariff Act of 1930.

No; the high-tariff, high-pressure boys will have to do better than this in their efforts to obstruct the reciprocal-trade program.

So, Mr. Speaker, statistics do not lie—but they sometimes do not bear up under the light of objective analysis. Also, to set the record straight, let us turn to the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] on the International Trade Conference, beginning on page 3182 of the Record for April 7. Mr. MASON, amid a great deal of emotionalizing against the State Department, made the following statement about the Geneva Conference and the proposed International Trade Organization. I quote:

Mr. Clayton and his assistants propose to do two things at this Conference: First, negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements with 18 other nations, and, second, to set up and establish an International Trade Organization as a department or branch of the United Nations Organization, said International Trade Organization to have the power to regulate, supervise, and control world trade.

In another part of the same speech Mr. MASON said:

Mr. Speaker, this International Trade Organization, in effect, would be an international super state. . . . It would be within the power of this international super state to say what American agricultural surpluses, or manufactured goods, or both, might be exported, and how much foreign goods could be imported into the United States.

And further on he said:

To adopt the proposals advocated by our State Department for an International Trade Organization would mean to transfer our governmental powers to a world economic authority.

What are the facts? Under Secretary Clayton, himself a successful businessman of unquestioned integrity, testified before our committee, of which the gentleman from Illinois is a member, as follows:

I might add here, that contrary to some misunderstandings, the International Trade Organization will not be an international supergovernment in the economic field, with power to fix tariffs of member countries or control either their foreign or domestic trade. Tariff adjustments under the charter—the matter of most interest to the United States—will be made by negotiation and only in return for comparable advantages, just as the United States has been doing for 13 years under the trade-agreements program. Member nations will voluntarily agree to refrain from imposing quotas and certain other trade restrictions and discriminations. The International Trade Organization will impose no new international controls or regulations on trade. Under its charter only one penalty can be incurred by any country which violates its commitments. Member countries may,

with the concurrence of the organization, withhold from such a country the trade benefits which they have agreed to extend to each other.

And further, Mr. Clayton testified:

The whole aim and purpose of the International Trade Organization and of the suggested charter is to reduce and minimize, not to increase, governmental interference with foreign trade carried on by private traders, and to guide that trade on economic, not political, principles.

That is what we are going to Geneva for—to bargain for a chance for American private enterprise to continue and to benefit the American economy through expanded foreign trade.

I also feel obliged to relate, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], in response to a question by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] as to whether the Congress will have an opportunity to pass upon the plan for an international trade organization, replied as follows:

There is a difference of opinion on that. Some claim that this international trade organization at Geneva will have to be submitted to the United States Senate for confirmation before it can be approved. Others say that is not so, that the United States Senate and the Congress can be sidetracked. I am not an international lawyer, so I cannot say.

It is to the great credit of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] that he brought out that Under Secretary Clayton made the flat statement to us on the Ways and Means Committee that he would submit the ITO charter to the Congress of the United States. And the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] added: "I think that is something that we must take him at his word on."

No, Mr. Speaker; no attempt will be made by Mr. Clayton to subvert the constitutional processes of this Government, regardless of all the inflammatory and ill-advised oratory; we may be assured of that.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitated to point out before the rest of the House these misstatements of fact by my fellow members of the Committee on Ways and Means about the reciprocal trade program and the Geneva Conference. But too much is at stake to allow the charges to go unanswered. Fortunately, the people of the country are well-informed about the Cordell Hull policies of reciprocity in our economic relations with other nations. A poll by the National Opinion Research Center of Denver (considered by many to be the most scientific of the samplers of public opinion), released on February 22, 1947, reveals that almost three out of every four people in the United States favor reciprocal reduction of tariffs placed on goods imported into this country. And there is no partisanship among the people on this issue, Mr. Speaker, for 74 percent of the Democrats, 72 percent of rank and file Republicans, and 73 percent of the public as a whole endorse the continued lowering of tariff barriers under a reciprocal trade program.

Mr. Speaker, with the American people so overwhelmingly in favor of a program of reciprocity, it would indeed be a travesty upon the democratic process for anything to be said or done in this

House, or in one of its committees, that should impair the efforts of Mr. Clayton and his staff in the slightest. For the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements with the 18 other countries represented at Geneva, is essential to the establishment of the International Trade Organization whose function it will be, within the United Nations, to avoid economic warfare.

As President Truman said so well in his address at Baylor University on March 6, 1947:

The policy of reducing barriers to trade is a settled policy of this Government. It is embodied in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, fathered and administered for many years by Cordell Hull. It is reflected in the charter of the International Trade Organization. It is one of the cornerstones of our plans for peace. It is a policy from which we cannot—and must not—turn aside.

To those among us—and there are still a few—who would seek to undermine this policy for partisan advantage and go back to the period of high tariffs and economic isolation, I can say only this: Take care. Times have changed. Our position in the world has changed. The temper of our people has changed. The slogans of 1930 or 1896 are sadly out of date. Isolationism, after two world wars, is a confession of mental and moral bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, the selfish little pressure blocs should be sent home and the hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means should be postponed until the next session, when the question of extending the reciprocal trade program will again be before the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman actually believe what he is saying there, that he wants to reduce tariffs?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I definitely do and I positively mean it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman wants to put the American workingman who is getting one or two dollars an hour in direct competition with the slave labor of the Orient and Europe?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am afraid the gentleman is thinking in the terms of the 1930's.

Mr. GROSS. No. I am thinking in terms of today, when you have more cheap slave labor in the world than you ever had before.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Let me answer the gentleman's question. It has been proven by history that the industrial production of the United States, in spite of the high wages, is so tremendous that no other nation in the world can compete with us in any respect whatsoever when it comes to industrial production. There is never any danger of the United States having unemployment when we increase our foreign trade. Our economic history shows that, and every economist will agree with me on that. The only people who come to this Congress and seek to have the tariffs raised are those people whose particular business will especially benefit by that, and I can name some of them.

Mr. GROSS. The greatest exponent you have for this program is Mr. Clayton?

Mr. EBERHARTER. He is one of the present exponents of it.

Mr. GROSS. He profited more than any other man in the country in the cotton game when he could get cotton sent in here cheap, when he himself goes down into Brazil and spends his millions to develop the cotton industry down there to bring it in in direct conflict with the very people he is supposed to protect. That is the way it works.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Let us not indulge in personalities. I cannot yield further if the gentleman does not give me a chance to answer. You know, since 1934 we have had this reciprocal trade agreements program in effect and nearly every country with which we have had these agreements has come to purchase a higher percentage of its imports from the United States. It thus expands our trade and helps our economic condition in this country.

Mr. GROSS. Be fair in your argument.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Seventy-three percent of the people of the country are educated to it now, and approve.

Mr. GROSS. During the war we did not feel the effects of it, but now we are feeling the effects.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether the increased amount of goods that these countries bought from the United States was due to the reciprocal trade agreement arrangement or was it due to our pouring the immense amount of funds into those countries which we have?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Nobody can prove absolutely that any one single factor caused the expansion of the export trade of the United States, but it is admitted by everybody that the reciprocal trade agreement program was one of the important factors that helped to increase the export trade of the United States. The United States, in spite of its strong position, cannot exist economically healthy and financially healthy unless it has a large export trade. That is admitted by every economist, every financier, every industrialist, and every businessman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have always felt that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act did not have an opportunity to demonstrate that because we got into the war and previous to the war we began to lend a lot of money to countries scattered all over the world. I am wondering how the gentlemen can prove his point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to say that in the years it was operating it did expand our trade tremendously. We have had enough experience with it, I think, that that must be admitted.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. The gentleman seems to me to be putting this reciprocal-trade question on a party basis. I wonder whether that is, in fact, an accurate way of putting it, in view of the positions

that Senator VANDENBERG and Senator MILLIKIN have taken with respect to this matter.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not think, or, at least, I did not want to give the impression that I was putting it on a partisan basis. I quoted that 72 percent of the people of this country who are Republicans favored this program, and that 74 percent of the people who are Democrats favor this program. So it is not a partisan issue at all. But I found it necessary, because of the statements made by these two gentlemen whom I mentioned earlier in my remarks, to stand on the floor of the House and refute what I considered misstatements on their part.

Mr. LODGE. I just wanted to make it clear in the Record that there is a large section of Republicans who favor the principle of reciprocal trade.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct about that, and I am happy that that is the situation. I know that there are some members of the Committee on Ways and Means who, at one time or another during their service in this House, voted for an extension of the program. But there is no use whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, in having committee hearings this year when the question of the renewal of the program will not come up until next year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

IS THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT LABOR'S BILL OF RIGHTS OR ITS DEATH WARRANT?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I should like to present to the House the testimony I gave before the House Committee on Education and Labor on February 19, 1947, relating to H. R. 3020 entitled Labor Management Relations Act of 1947. In my judgment the National Labor Relations Act, commonly called the Wagner Act, does not bestow upon wage earners the benefits claimed. I am convinced, from as careful and unbiased a study as I have been able to make of this act and its operation, that, instead of being helpful to those who earn their living by physical exertion, it is doing them the greatest conceivable harm. Furthermore, I am certain that the procedures under this act have developed to a stage that menaces our social order. The reason why this is so and cannot be otherwise becomes clear when one understands the true nature of this law and its long-run effects.

The Wagner Act starts by saying:

Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees.

There was no experience that proved compulsory bargaining does the things alleged in this preamble. If there was, I

have been unable to find any evidence of it in any of the literature bearing upon this subject. So far as I can ascertain, this enunciation professing what experience had proved was wholly without foundation.

But now we have had experience with the "right of employees to organize and bargain collectively," protected by law. From the evidence at hand, it appears that this experience has proved just the reverse of what the proponents of the act alleged had been the case in the past.

I am convinced that protection by law of what the Wagner Act calls the "right of employees to organize and bargain collectively" has had the effect of producing the wrongs which the act says were caused by the absence of such right.

Instead of safeguarding commerce from injury, impairment, and interruption, it has so endangered commerce as to interfere enormously with its free flow. Instead of lessening and mitigating industrial strife and unrest, it has increasingly produced these evils. Instead of creating friendly relations between employers and employees, it has incited workmen to dislike and harass their employers to a point where strained relations between these groups have become chronic in a large segment of industry. Instead of reducing industrial disputes and strikes, it has greatly increased and made them pandemic.

The rank and file of unionized and free wage earners and the public in general have not been unaware of these developments. They have observed with misgivings the ever-mounting tide of strikes and their evil effects: Direct loss of income to persons on strike; indirect harm done to others, such as the causing of unemployment in plants depending on parts from strike-bound industries; aggravation of existing material shortages and the causing of new ones; the lowering of output by stifling the more efficient workers and reducing all to a dead level of production, and so forth.

Unionized workers are beginning to wonder whether the raises in wages they have been getting represent real gains, seeing as they do that such raises are always followed by rises in prices.

I think it would be a great mistake to assume that the rank and file of unionized workers are not doing some serious thinking about this whole problem. The frightful spectacle of the threatened paralysis of the entire productive and distributive system caused by the railroad strike last May, and the incipient paralysis brought on by the recent coal strike must still be fresh in their minds. Surely they, as well as all other employees, saw and have not forgotten that they were the first to feel the evil effects of the coal strike and the last to be benefited by its discontinuance.

In referring to unions I wish it understood that I do not include those of a purely local character, voluntary associations of workmen formed for the purpose of improving their employment status and maintaining healthy relations with their employers.

It is also hardly likely that the miners feel elated and more content over their experience in 1943, when they were

daily reminded by seeing the Stars and Stripes and a poster with the legend "Government property" on every tippie, that they were working under what their union leaders considered duress.

Is it reasonable to suppose the events connected with the recent coal strike are heartening to the miners? Suppose the Supreme Court upholds Judge Goldsborough's decision? Will the miners cheerfully submit to paying the fine imposed upon them and peacefully and enthusiastically return to work? Could this be expected? Assume the high court reverses the lower—what will be the situation. Will the case then be settled on Lewis' terms and the miners continue on working, or will the whole controversy again flare up and the miners once more stay away from the pits?

No one—certainly none on the outside—can predict with any degree of certainty what will come of the situation. One thing, however, is as probable as anything can be: The authoritarian regime in control of the Government will avail itself to the fullest extent possible of every opportunity the case presents to absorb as much additional social power as it can. Therefore, however the Supreme Court decides, it becomes almost certain that the regime in control of the Government will come through with its power enhanced and resistance to its progressive encroachment upon the social body further enervated.

The final disposition of the case by the highest tribunal, since the foregoing was written, registered a highly significant and far-reaching advance toward statism.

We should also consider the alarm occasioned employees—especially railroad workers—by the almost successful attempt made by the President last May, during the railroad strike, to pass what high union officials called a slave labor bill. It will be recalled that the railroads were then under Government seizure, presumably to meet the strike situation. The President urged with all the force and strategy he could command the enactment of legislation which would authorize him to indefinitely suspend the railroad labor unions and conscript all railroad employees and employers into the Army, where they would be subjected to working under compulsion. In that position they would be under military rule and discipline and amenable to trial by court martial, perchance even shot for violations.

The President's bill would have empowered him to seize any and all plants and to treat the workers the same as he sought to do with the railroad employees.

Surely this frightful proposal with its potential danger to the rank and file of railroad and all other employees could hardly help arousing in their minds grave misgivings and cause them to wonder where they were being led—whether into the green pastures they had been promised or possibly into some region of darkness and despair.

The new Congress sufficiently recognizes the overwhelming sentiment that has been precipitated by the railroad and coal strikes for the enactment of measures to correct the evils caused by the

Wagner Act and to prevent another crisis, such as we experienced in connection with those strikes, to impel it to act.

But now arise some important questions. It is clear enough that the public wants Congress to provide a remedy for the removal of the strike menace. But is it certain the public knows what it would take to eradicate this economic malady? Furthermore, does the Congress know the answer? And, if so, do we possess the determination and courage to apply the appropriate remedy? These are pertinent and serious questions. Depending upon the responses given them, the earnest prayer that is coming from the souls of our people, and not the least from unfree as well as free workers, for real and lasting relief from the strike menace will either be answered or this Nation will, in my humble judgment, continue right on moving further toward chaos and absolute dictatorship.

Candor and forthrightness are prerequisite to a factual statement of the nature of the Wagner Act.

It is basic to a correct diagnosis of the underlying cause of what is called industrial strife that we fully grasp this one central fact: The real issue involved is not between employers and employees or between capital and labor; the real and only material issue is between employers and the rank and file of both unionized and free employees and the general public on the one hand, and the authoritarian regime in control of the Government on the other hand. We are here primarily dealing with a political, not a management-labor problem. The industrial strife which besets the Nation does not spring from conditions that inhere in employer-employee relationships, or in private capitalism, mass production, the wage system, or technological advance. Furthermore, it does not have its origin with the rank and file of wage earners. Its primary source is political and its seat is located within the structure of the regime directly controlling the Government.

It is the authoritarian power which has intruded itself into the field of employer-employee relations that we must attack. Until this fact is realized and the Congress takes steps to eradicate the power over management and labor, which it and the persons operating the other two branches of the Government have built up, we shall not only continue to misdirect our efforts to restore industrial peace but we are bound to aggravate the trouble.

The body of union officials is but an intermediary of the authoritarian regime.

The Wagner Act legalizes compulsory bargaining on both employers and employees but does not define such bargaining.

It empowers a majority of the employees in a plant to bargain not only for itself but to make such bargaining compulsory on the minority also. It imposes upon the employer the duty of enforcing the latter provision.

It prohibits the employer from engaging in what the Labor Relations Board considers unfair labor practices; interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the right of self-organization

to form, join, or assist labor unions, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or for other mutual aid or protection; dominating or interfering with the formation or administration of any labor organization or contributing financial or other support to it; encouraging or discouraging members in any labor organization by discrimination in regard to hire or tenure of employment; discharging or in any manner discriminating against employees because they filed charges or gave testimony under certain sections of the act; refusing to bargain collectively with the representatives of the employees. The act in fact prohibits employers from exercising their constitutional right of free speech.

The act legalizes the "closed shop," which anticipates the destruction of all independent unions and forced unionization of all employees, just as developed under communism in Russia, nazism in Germany, and fascism in Italy.

The act sets up an agency, the Labor Relations Board, to operate it. This agency is empowered to exercise any or all of its powers at any place in the United States. One or more of its members may prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions anywhere. Any member who participates in such an inquiry does not disqualify himself from subsequently participating in a decision of the agency in the same case. Thus the agency becomes prosecutor, judge, and jury at the same time.

The agency is given liberty from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out what it interprets to be the provisions of the act. Mere publication of such additions and changes make them law.

The agency is empowered to decide in each case whether the unit appropriate for collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof.

The agency is further authorized to take a secret ballot of employees or utilize any method it elects to ascertain the representation of the employees in any and all questions relating to "unfair labor practices," and so forth.

The power vested in the National Labor Relations Board to prevent an employer from engaging in what it determines to be an unfair labor practice "shall be exclusive and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise." This is an amazing provision of law, to say the least. According to this the Congress has no business to even consider modifying or repealing the Wagner Act.

It is all the more astounding when we read another provision of the act in connection herewith; namely, the following:

The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States, or any State or political subdivision thereof * * *

Perhaps nothing quite so much exposes the spirit of the forces in control of the Government, when the Wagner Act was written, to annihilate the Constitution and assume authoritarian power as the two last above-mentioned provisions. They are a veritable pronouncement of contempt of law and order, private capitalism, and ownership of property, competition, and everything that even smacks of liberty.

Shades of Louis XVI: "The state, the state; I am the state."

The agency is empowered to serve notice upon any person against whom complaint has been made for "unfair labor practices" and other acts which it deems violations. It is authorized to amend at its discretion such complaint which must however be effected prior to the issuance of an order based thereon. But—

In the discretion of the member, agent, or agency, conducting the hearing or the Board, any other person may be allowed to intervene in the said proceedings and present testimony. In any such proceeding the rules of evidence prevailing in courts of law or equity shall not be controlling * * *

And—

The findings of the Board as to the facts if supported by evidence shall be conclusive.

It is further provided that either party to a dispute may apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, that the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the agency, but whatever the new findings may be, such agency still determines the validity of the evidence from which there is no appeal.

This puts the political agency, the Board, in a position to go back and rig up anything it deems to be evidence, and the matter stands as it did before the court granted leave to adduce such additional evidence.

The act declares it to be the policy of the United States to encourage the practice and procedure of collective bargaining and protecting the exercise of workers of full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of their own choosing for the purpose of negotiating the terms and conditions of their employment and other mutual aid or protection.

From a reading of the Wagner Act and an evaluation of its operation since its passage, the conclusion is inescapable that, whether the objective sought by the persons primarily responsible for its passage was the annihilation of independent employee associations and the unionization of all employees by compulsion under domination of the political forces controlling the Government, it has unmistakably materially developed in that direction.

Legalizing the strike weapon provides those forces with the necessary power to effectuate that purpose. True, the law—if law you can call it—does not directly put them in the business of actually calling strikes. It does, however, put them in the business of producing all of the conditions which make strikes inevitable. De facto the Federal political regime is engaged in the work of calling strikes and sanctioning all the evils attendant thereto. It is, however, not accountable

for anything that happens in connection with strikes. Only State laws can reach the violations connected therewith. It has in the last 10 years set in motion forces which eventuated in the destruction of billions of dollars worth of property, loss of billions more in wages, mutilation of persons and even death, besides seriously disrupting industry and threatening collapse of the very means by which workmen earn the daily bread for themselves and their families. Later on I shall mention the ultimate end achieved in carrying out this program.

There are several rough measures for determining the share of the damage done by the use of the strike weapon in the last 10 years which is directly chargeable to the authoritarian regime which we call our Government. Dr. Willford I. King publishes some statistics which I believe are on a reasonably sound basis and which appear to me to be suggestive of the part which such regime has played in the great increase of strikes. He shows that while the total labor union membership increased from 3,889,000 in 1935—when the Wagner Act was passed—to 16,000,000 in 1945, or 311 percent, the number of persons habitually working as employees increased during the same period from 39,600,000 to 44,635,000, or only 12.7 percent. Dr. King shows that the average annual percent of all employees unionized during the 35-year period 1900-35 was approximately 10 percent, while the percent of employees unionized over the period 1936-45, inclusive, averaged approximately 24 percent. Or, the average annual percent of all employees unionized over the period since the enactment of the Wagner Law was approximately two and one-half times that of the 35-year period preceding the passage of this law. The highest percent of employees unionized in any single year before the Wagner Act was 17 percent in 1920, while the figure reached 36 percent in the year 1945. I think it is fair to say that the legalizing of compulsory union membership and the strike to make this effective, together with other provisions of the Wagner Act, are responsible for most of the increase in union membership since its passage and that this, therefore, in large measure reflects the great increase in strikes and the consequences that resulted therefrom during the last 10 years.

I think the great increase in the cost of operating the National Labor Relations Board over the 10-year period of its operation roughly reflects the part played by the authoritarian regime in producing the increase of labor-management difficulties or so-called industrial strife which has taken place during that period. There is no more accurate means for measuring the damage which political forces controlling governments do to social progress than the rate of taxation. The lower the rate, the greater the progress, and vice versa. The cost of operating this political agency increased steadily each year from \$713,342 in 1936 to \$4,307,330 in 1946. The very nature of the function of this agency compels it to incite employees to conduct that leads to the evils which it is claimed the Wagner Act was set up to prevent. If this

is true and the above data and conclusions are correct, it should suggest to the sitting Congress its duty in the matter.

It should not be overlooked that the interests of wage earners are not the same as those of aspiring politicians and union officials. Indeed, basically the interests of these two groups violently clash. Friendly relations between employees and employers and a willingness to cooperate with each other to iron out whatever differences that may arise between them, to mutually strive for common advancement by increasing production and expanding plant facilities, are not only of great advantage to employees, but they are absolutely prerequisite to a sound and growing social organism, an ever-rising living standard. Such relations are a veritable anathema to ambitious politicians and union officials. The existence of the former largely and that of the latter almost wholly depend upon ill will and strife between employers and employees. Herein lies the reason why these two elements make a profession of preaching class hatred and inciting employees to violence against their employers. There can be no question that both of these elements in the body social batten on conflict between employers and employees. Practically all of the serious industrial strife and turmoil that now prevails has been artificially produced by these two groups.

Looking at the objective that is being achieved by the Wagner Act, I cannot conceive how it is possible to escape the conclusion that it derives directly from the Communist, Nazi, and Fascist means to political power; or if it does not stem from such procedure it nevertheless duplicates it.

Compulsory unionization of workers was perhaps one of the key devices, if not the principal one, used by the Communists in Russia, the Nazis in Germany, and the Fascists in Italy to build their totalitarian regimes. Unionization was made compulsory on all workers in those countries. As this procedure developed, political power expanded with correlative suppression of freedom of employees. Intolerance to strikes grew apace until a stage was reached where they were prohibited by law. Thereupon unions were entirely blacked out and the process of liquidating union officials was in full force. Those who survived by finding favor with the ruling clique—we shall perhaps never know their number—became integrated with it and took their places as drivers of the very souls they had but a short time previously allegedly befriended.

At about the time unionization became complete the power of the regimes in the totalitarian countries was sufficiently developed to permit them to purge all recalcitrant elements, thus completing the one-party system and abolishing the franchise, or what amounts to the same thing—controlling it.

Manya Gordon in his book, *Workers Before and After Lenin*, says that as far back as 1922 the eleventh congress of the Communist Party under the guidance of Lenin, in defining the position of the party on strikes, resolved that:

Neither the Communist Party nor the Soviet government nor the trade-unions can

under any circumstances forget that the resort to strikes in a country with a proletarian government can be described only as a bureaucratic assault on the proletarian government and as a survival of the capitalist past and its institutions on the one hand, and as showing a lack of political development and the cultural backwardness of the toilers on the other.

Gordon quotes further from resolutions of the ninth congress as follows:

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the trade-unions cease to be organizations which sell labor power to an employing class. There can be no question of trade-union opposition to the institutions of the Soviet state. Such opposition is a deviation from Marxism to bourgeois trade-unionism.

Gordon further quotes Stalin and his associates as having declared:

The trade-unions are called upon to play a decisive role in the task of building socialist industry by stimulating labor productivity, labor discipline, and socialist competition, and extirpating all remnants of guild isolation and "trade-unionism."

Henceforth the trade-unions—

says Gordon—

were compelled to drive the workers, to organize "shock brigades" and "socialist competition" and bring to trial workers who lagged behind their quantitative "norms" or in quality. As a result the trade-unions in Soviet Russia are today a misnomer, and have nothing basically in common with similar organizations in other countries. They are merely a whip over the workers as plainly shown in the resolutions adopted in the second year of the 5-year plan, at the sixteenth congress of the Communist Party in 1930.

Union officials in our country should be aware that the trend is definitely in the direction of complete political control over unions and their activities. Strikes are being tolerated by both the public and the authoritarian regime less and less and if the drift continues, the time is not too distant when they will not be tolerated at all.

The political forces in control of the Government are well aware of the situation and are losing no opportunity to take advantage of it to further socialize the industry of the Nation. They know that as disorder of the economy increases, the public's resistance to collectivization weakens and as this proceeds such forces covertly usurp control over unions as well as the economy in general. The end will be the absolute state which does not tolerate unions. Their leaders perish with its creation; they serve to construct it but in doing so destroy themselves.

With our own eyes we have seen this happen in Communist Russia, Nazi Germany, and Fascist Italy. And do we not even now see signs of the same development in England? It seems to me our union leaders should be able to see growing evidences of the same kind in our own country. Was not the attempt by the President last May to suspend the railroad labor unions, conscript the employees into the Army, and compel them to work under military orders enough notice to them of the ominous trend? Can the procedures attending the President's handling of the coal strike be otherwise interpreted than a determination on the part of the authoritarian regime to put the miners' union directly under its control?

It is a stratagem, and we fear an all too effective one, on the part of the authoritarian regime, to single out a few top union leaders for castigation, as though they were primarily to blame for the dangers attending the strike movement. Of course, they are presumptuous men. But how did they get that way? From whence did they derive the power that causes them to be so bold as to challenge the regime controlling the Government except from such regime itself through class legislation? The rationale of chastising a handful of union leaders is to make scapegoats of them to atone for the wrongdoing of the authoritarian regime.

I think it can be laid down as a certainty that if the Wagner Act, along with much other legislation, of course, is not repealed and matters are permitted to drift on, liquidation of unions and union officials and what is left of representative government and free enterprise will follow as surely as night follows day.

It is the grossest delusion to suppose that we can permanently adopt a part of the authoritarian system. Union leaders, intellectuals, and politicians in Russia, Germany, and Italy were shortsighted enough to think they could. That erroneous belief is written on almost every page of the record of communism, nazism, and fascism. There just is no such thing as limited authoritarianism. You are either in it all the way or out of it all the way.

Now let us go to the essence of the Wagner Act and see just what it ultimately does to the working people. Bear in mind that the act makes it a function of the authoritarian regime controlling the Federal Government to destroy independent local unions and associations of employees, to coerce employees to join international and affiliated unions, and put all employees under compulsion to bargain collectively. The effect of these and other procedures under the act is to annihilate the wage earner's instinctive and inalienable right to bargain for the sale of his own services to sustain self and family, and permit the authoritarian regime to attain monopoly power over the sale of his toil for its own aggrandizement. Always keep in mind that it is the forces controlling the Government that in the end hold this power, not the officers of so-called labor unions.

This involves slavery. The same technique has been used to bring this about as was used by Lenin and Stalin to perfect the dictatorship of the proletariat. I have already mentioned that it was declared in the ninth congress of the Soviet Union that:

Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the trade-unions ceased to be organizations which sell labor to an employing class.

The Soviet regime seized that power from the labor unions simply by taking over—lock, stock, and barrel—both unions and their officials.

It cannot be too much stressed that the monopoly power of the union hierarchy to sell labor to employers is but a delegated power and of a temporary nature in any event. The authoritarian regime farms out to union officials

the power to collect tribute from laborers something like the Roman emperors used to farm out to their favorites the power to collect taxes in the provinces.

Take from a person the power to sell his labor, and you make him your slave. Sir Henry Maine, in his work entitled "Ancient Law," gives a clear and concise definition of slavery.

The simple wish to use the bodily powers of another person—

he says—

as a means of ministering to one's own ease or pleasure is doubtless the foundation of slavery and as old as human nature.

Compulsion is necessarily the controlling element of the institution of human slavery. Since compulsion is the thing that makes monopoly power over the sale of labor possible, the conclusion is inescapable that the political regime controlling our Government is in the process of completely enslaving the wage earners of this Nation. Of course, it cannot enslave some people and not all.

Let us glance at what is happening to the wage system under the Wagner and other acts. In my judgment, one of the most glorious chapters in the history of social progress is that which traces the evolution of the wage system. Most people, perhaps without thinking, take the wage system for granted, as though it had always been with us. This is a mistake. Time was when nothing even remotely resembling it existed. Like all other social institutions it is the result of evolution and has its roots deep in the past. Frederic Bastiat, the great French student of the social organism, sketched its origin and development. He showed how man's instinct of security created that association which lifted him from the fortuitous mode of existence that prevailed in primitive social organization, where all share risks and catches alike, up through the long and arduous process of division of employments, culminating in a system where one group of workers called employers specializes in taking all the risks in anticipation of securing sufficient profits to provide for personal wants and the tools of production which are essential to a healthy, vigorous, and expanding social organism, whilst securing to another group of workers called employees the advantage of regular wages—that is, fixity or security.

Voluntary association, cooperation, and mutual exchange of services under competition—that is, under conditions free from political constraint—are the sources of all real social security. Out of this complex of relationships evolved the wage system and the security to the wage earner which it affords. Herein is to be found the living magna carta of wage earners. Was not this superb social institution made possible by free, laissez faire behavior? I have not been able to adduce from my studies of the evolution of the social organism any evidence that the political element ever contributed anything of value to its development. It seems to me that if there is one fact recorded in history that stands out more prominently than any other it is that the political element has

always been in conflict with social progress. Demagoguery to make political capital by attacking industrial capital seems to be an ever-present plague upon the social body.

Of course, the wage system is not perfect. No social system is. Like all other social institutions it is not static but continually undergoes change which inherently is in the direction of betterment. It has undergone a wholesome change in our generation. Much evidence is at hand to support this contention. But look at the record and see how people with small means hold investments in stocks, bonds, insurance companies, and so forth. Note also how the organization of private capital under voluntary contract makes possible the continuance of wage payments over periods of years by large segments of industry operating at a loss, as we saw in the 1930's, in anticipation based on experience of probably being able to recoup such loss at some future time. These and similar other developments have largely taken place within the last century. Surely no argument should be needed to show that they have greatly added to the security of all the low-income groups. If the process had been left to develop in its natural way—that is, if the political element had been kept out of it—there is little question but that the gains of working people would be much greater than they now are.

The point I wish to make here is that the authoritarian regime controlling the Government is using the Wagner Act to destroy the wage system and is throwing the workman back into a status of serfdom. There is no substitute for the wage system but slavery.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the problem before your committee can be boiled down to this simple proposition: Would it be better to repeal the Wagner Act, retain the wage system, give back to the working people their self-preserving right to bargain for the sale of their own toil, and allow them to hold onto the social gains they have made over the centuries, or would it be better to leave this measure on the statute books to completely destroy the wage system and the right of individual bargaining, and cause the working people to revert to a status of serfdom? I think the question before you is just that simple.

Far be it from me to avow that the lot of all wage earners is an easy one. I know from experience that the contrary is true. All who have been compelled to rely upon the wages of day labor for a livelihood in industries such as coal mines, refractories, steel mills, and so forth, will agree to this. All sensible people would like to see the condition of those workers bettered; if not for their sake, then for their own. The higher the plane of living of wage earners, the higher must be that of all groups, and vice versa.

All this, however, is entirely beside the point. The truth is that the workmen's status has progressively improved over the many centuries, always in proportion to the degree of freedom enjoyed by him. What we are deliberating now is whether to try to hold onto the social

processes which have improved the posture of day laborers or to permit those processes to be destroyed and cause them to lose all their hard-earned gains.

The Wagner Act should be repealed outright. It is an authoritarian and completely antisocial device through and through. Every part of it operates to destroy the tools by which the workman earns his livelihood; to annihilate his God-given right to sell his own labor; to destroy his security; to snatch from him the fruit of his own toil and to reduce him to the status of a slave.

To establish means for arbitrating so-called industrial disputes would be to make more complete the authoritarian regime's monopoly power over the sale of human toil. This would enormously add to its power of corruption. Disputes would not and could not be settled fairly. It is contrary to the nature of things for this to be possible. Every school child knows that disputes would be settled in favor of the side that promised the most votes, regardless of which political party happened to be in power.

A mediation board might be a sop to the public. Like an arbitration board it could settle nothing fairly and it would also be something to play politics with.

Should the Congress give the authoritarian regime in control of the Government power to seize plants where strikes are threatened or in process and arbitrate disputes involved in the controversies that led to the impending or actual stoppages the end of all hope to restore constitutional government and free enterprise might well be in sight. If the Congress wants to take drastic action to greatly increase the power of the authoritarian regime over the lives of our people it would do well to provide legislation to permit such regime to seize strike-bound plants on the pretense of settling so-called labor disputes.

It is being suggested by persons in high official quarters that strikes should be directly outlawed in critically essential industries, railroads, coal mines, and so forth. How possibly could this be done without the authoritarian regime sooner or later taking these industries over and making the employees connected therewith a part of the Federal bureaucracy with all the inefficiency and circumlocution that goes with it? Should these industries become a part of the bureaucracy there is every reason to believe all industries would progressively be made to follow suit.

Industry-wide strikes should be prohibited, but on the same principle that corporations, partnerships, and individuals are prohibited from acting in concert to fix prices. Labor wages are but the obverse and commodity prices the converse of the same coin. Wages are prices. The Norris-LaGuardia Act should be repealed and the antitrust laws applied to prevent both the union officers and the authoritarian regime controlling the Government from attaining monopoly control over the sale of human labor.

Legislation should be enacted reasserting and guaranteeing to every citizen his constitutional and self-preserving right to work when, where, and at whatever

occupation is open to him for employment, at any wage he can individually and voluntarily agree upon with an employer, without having to pay tribute to anyone or belong to any organization. Every vestige of coercion in the field of employer-employee relationships should be annihilated. Anything less than this is slavery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the plan of the President to expand our international policy to aid and defend, if necessary, the nations of the world by starting off with the Greek-Turkish deal of \$500,000,000 is only a down payment. It is a first step on the plan which will most likely be followed with huge expenditures in aid to the rest of the world within the next few years of five to ten billion dollars in money. And, if we are drawn into a military conflict the expense will be colossal.

One of the most reliable economists and financial writers in the Nation whose name I will not quote, takes this view and says, the State Department which has drawn the blue prints for this expanse of international policy, is so afraid of public opinion that it and the administration are withholding the larger plan until they get started on the road and that they desire to bring on the additional costs later in piecemeal, on the theory that the Congress and the people will accept a constant trickle of expense rather than the deluge which the sum total would amount to. He says that Russia does not want peace or agreements now, believing that by delaying tactics within the next 2 years that England, France, and other European nations will be hopelessly bankrupt by that time, and that the United States will have extended herself so far financially that we will then have to back away in order to prevent financial bankruptcy at home. That when this occurs Russia expects by such delaying tactics to have brought about a world financial condition that her expansion in Europe and Asia can be accomplished without serious opposition.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be hoped that the above predictions will not come to pass but they are worthy of consideration coming from a source that makes a constant study of domestic and world problems, a source that is in nowise influenced by a partisan political outlook. We do know that England and France who have engaged in two world-wide wars are both bled white financially and that their financial situation is so bad that we have been compelled to make huge loans to each of these nations in the hope that maybe we can help them to regain some sort of financial solvency. We do know that we have shipped and shot away billions of dollars' worth of the resources of this country and that thousands of our young men have already given their lives on the European Continent, a loss that can never be repaid.

We do know that our international debt stands around \$260,000,000,000 and that we are committed to \$1,500,000,000 in relief to the rest of the world for the coming year without considering the Greek-Turkish loan.

Mr. Speaker, the question this Congress representing the people has to decide is whether the President's approach is the right approach to this question. There is a great desire upon my part and upon the part of every Member of the House and Senate in a crisis like this to uphold the hands of the State Department and the President as well. We would like General Marshall, our Secretary of State now in Berlin, and the world to know that the American people are united, that they are opposed to Russia dominating other smaller nations in Europe, Asia, or anywhere else. Yet, at the same time, the sovereign power of our country is the people of the United States.

This proposal has been thrust upon the Congress, the representatives of the people, with such urgent haste for action and with such a force of publicity back of it that the people have not had time, or have not had the facts as to both sides of the problem upon which they can base their fair and accurate judgment.

Mr. Speaker, there are only two choices that can be made under the present situation. We must either vote favorably to this expansion of our international policy or we must vote against it. Obviously in dividing on this question a mistake is bound to be made. It seems to me the most important service the representatives of the people can render is to obtain all possible facts before they make their decision.

Our leaders must not make a mistake this time. Let us look at the record and see how well they have led us up to date.

First. Before we entered World War II we were asked to repeal our neutrality laws so the ships from other nations could come to our shores and buy implements of war. We were assured that would not in any way tend to get us involved in the conflict.

Second. Later we were told that the extension of lend-lease to the nations opposing the Axis Powers would more likely tend to keep us out of the war than to get us into it. Churchill said, "Give us the tools and we will do the job."

Third. We were told that the arming of our merchant ships would not get us into the war.

Fourth. That the principles of the Atlantic Charter were endorsed by all of the Allied Nations which provided for self-determination of the people as to their governments and for governments of freedom.

Fifth. Our slogan to bolster the morale of the people and our soldiers was that we were fighting to destroy dictatorship in the world. We did destroy the Axis dictators, but in Europe we now face a totalitarian, dictatorial form of government that threatens to enslave all continental Europe and Asia.

Sixth. Our representatives at Tehran and particularly at Yalta partitioned Poland without her knowledge or consent

in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter in a secret agreement that was not known for 2 years thereafter.

Seventh. Also, at Yalta, Korea, without her knowledge or consent, and in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, was partitioned between Russia and the United States for a 5-year occupancy by these two governments.

Eighth. Russia was also given the Kurile Island bases, dangerous to the future peace of the Philippines, other strategic port advantages, participation in the ownership and operation of the Manchurian Railway, and was so firmly established in Manchuria that she is reported to have looted billions of dollars worth of the resources of that country.

Ninth. At the Potsdam agreement, in connection with the prior Yalta agreement, Russia was given further German territory and, in addition to the Silesian coal fields of such great importance, Russia was largely given control of the agricultural section of Germany.

The result is that the Potsdam agreement was so loosely drawn—and from an economic standpoint, so far as Germany and Europe are concerned, is so unworkable because of the lack of cooperation on the part of Russia—that the question confronting Britain and the United States at the peace table today is whether or not, with the control of the agricultural and food supply of Russia, with her delaying tactics, will she be able to prevent the reconstruction of Germany to the point where finally the United States and Britain will pull out so that Russia may then take control of all of Germany.

Mr. Speaker, the mistakes of our leaders and the State Department up to date have got us into a position where Britain and the United States have been expending, and will have to continue to expend, each, \$400,000,000 a year for food for the German people in their territories, while Russia controls the food producing and a lot of the industrial area of Germany given to her under the Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

Mr. Speaker, there was never any reason why Russia should have been given the Kurile Islands, other strategic parts of Manchuria, and certainly no reason why she should ever have been invited as one of the occupying forces of Korea. By the same divide-and-conquer tactics in Korea, we have put our section of Korea on the pension list for about \$400,000,000 a year, at least, for the near future because Russia refuses to cooperate.

Mr. Speaker, we were promised peace through the United Nations organization. The world was promised peace. We find that the United Nations organization has been so loosely drawn that any one of the Big Five, which means Russia, England, United States, China, or France, has a veto power in the Security Council. Russia has used its veto power until no agreements worth while can be made either at the peace table or within the United Nations organization. There is less peace, less freedom from want and fear in the world today than there has been in many years.

This is only a part of the record of our leaders and the State Department in handling international affairs. In viewing this record I think one is justified in seriously asking the question, Are they sure they are right this time when they ask the American people to underwrite with finances the military and manpower necessary to a world-wide extension of our international policy?

Then the next question I would have follow, that is, Can the United States afford to obligate itself to try to back up these commitments world-wide, taking into consideration the fact that our national debt now stands at \$260,000,000,000?

Mr. Speaker, can we continue to finance the world and increase our obligations throughout the world at the rate we have been going without dragging our 140,000,000 American people down into abject poverty? I think the basic question is, Can we finance such a program?

We are all opposed to communism and we can all endorse the laudable ideal of the President to stop communism in the Middle East. Ideals and realities are two different things. The reality of this attempt must make us think the thing through further than the ideal. We must consider the cost in millions, and possibly billions, of dollars. If the expending of \$500,000,000 with Greece and Turkey would stop the expansion of communism in the Middle East it would be well spent. If it does not, but, to the contrary, brings us nearer to a clash with Russia, then we must consider whether or not the fathers and mothers of this country are willing to see the draft boards go into action again with the drafting of millions of our young men. It might be the means of bringing on a world war between this country and Russia in the near future. Of course, we all hope it will not, but this problem is so involved and so complex that if the majority of the House and Congress votes to back up the President, not a Member of the House or Senate, or the President, will definitely know whether it is the right step to take. History only will record whether or not our Nation followed the right course.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a better course our Nation can follow.

In December 1945, I made a speech on the floor of the House in which I pointed out that the delaying tactics and objections by Russia had proved that Russia had never honestly intended to help form a United Nations organization to keep the peace of the world. That having the veto power, she would continue to delay the organization and block its effectiveness, while at the same time she would grab all territory she could in Europe and expand greatly before the organization could be completed. That is what has happened.

I urged the American members to join with the British members and offer amendments to the United Nations organization—first, that would do away with the veto power in the Security Council; second, an amendment to compel all nations to agree to world-wide

inspection as to atomic-energy development from the mines through the laboratories and to the factories; third, that a world-wide limitation or quota on armament be agreed upon.

I urged that such amendments could be passed, and if Russia opposed them and walked out of the organization, then the other peace-loving nations should complete the organization, which, at that time, held about 70 percent of the military power of the world. I advocated leaving the door wide open with a standing invitation to Russia to come in and that if she desired to remain out, this 70 percent of world military power could brand her an aggressor nation any time she disturbed the peace of the world, and by international law hurl the military might of the rest of the world against her.

I said this would leave Russia the alternative to come into this organization for peace, to commit national suicide if she became an aggressor nation.

I believe it is not too late to take such action now, and that if such action were taken it would be the most effective way to call Russia's bluff and at the same time appeal to world public sentiment which is still a tremendous force that would carry the United Nations organization rapidly forward in power and prestige throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, if this course is followed it would offer new hope for freedom from the domination of Russia to millions of people in Poland, Austria, Hungary, Germany, France, Bulgaria, Rumania, Greece, Turkey, China, and all of the people of the world seeking liberty. It would build up a resistance in these countries against the further spread of communism in my opinion, a hundred times greater than the proposal to move into Greece and Turkey. I believe it is the only move that will ever place the United Nations organization in a position to control aggressors and bring peace to the world.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the economy of the Pacific Northwest, as well as all of the Western States, is largely dependent upon full use of its water resources. The development and use of the waterways of the Northwest for navigation, hydroelectric power, reclamation, irrigation, and for domestic use, farming, and industry is the key to the success and prosperity of the inhabitants of this vast area. The congressional district I have the honor to represent borders on the Columbia River and the Bonneville project is located therein. Next to the Mississippi River, the Columbia is the largest river in the United States in water volume and is the largest in potential hydroelectric power, containing approximately one-half of our available supply.

While the people of the West in the last election expressed a desire by their votes to support a program of economy in our Nation to the end that cost of government might be decreased, wasteful and extravagant expenditures eliminated, taxes and the national debt reduced, and the budget balanced, they did so on the assumption that the wealth-produc-

ing public works of our country which are self-sustaining should be fostered and developed. The greatest of these in the West are our water resources. It would be ill-advised and poor economy not to appropriate adequate funds for carrying forward as rapidly as the need requires, the development of these great water resources for our self-sustaining projects which return to the Federal Government with interest all the moneys expended thereon. Among such projects is Bonneville, which at the existing rate for hydroelectric energy of \$17.50 per kilowatt-year will return to the Government all of the moneys expended by it for the development of the power facilities.

Both the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants are now loaded to an overload capacity. The industries which take a large portion of this power are not industries that have moved from other sections of the country, but are industries that originally located in the Northwest because of resources such as I have named and the factors governing worldwide industrial development and competition. The large going industries using this power would locate in foreign countries rather than other sections of this country if the power rate was arbitrarily elevated above the cost of production.

In the first place, anyone who has made a study of industrial migration will find that, as a general proposition, any industry which moves into any locality on wheels generally moves out on wheels or eventually closes down. Industrial placement depends largely on location of natural resources, an ample supply of cheap power, water and rail transportation, and access to markets. Those who wish factual proof on this point can find the same in the hearings before the Senate Military Affairs Committee and the Senate Small Business Committee when the matter of critical and strategic materials and light metals was under consideration in connection with the late war effort.

When the Bonneville Act was under consideration by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, and likewise the Senate Committee on Commerce, these groups spent nearly a year and a half exploring all the points embraced in power rates. These points were exhaustively debated, both on the House and Senate floors. The ablest men on both sides of the aisle participated in drafting the Bonneville Act. The policy governing contracts, rate-making, full return to the Federal Treasury, and return insurance are all adequately covered in the Bonneville Act. Furthermore, the Bonneville Act guarantees full and complete repayment of all items of cost covering all power features of the applicable Federal construction. Specifically, the congressional policy governing power contracts is covered in sections 2-F and 5-A of the Bonneville Act. Rate-making is covered in sections 5, 6, and 7, and rate adjustments to guarantee a return to the Treasury are covered in section 5-A, and reimbursability requirement appears in section 7. These statute citations are full and adequate. The State of Oregon has nothing to fear in any equitable con-

sideration of the electric rate applying to federally owned Columbia power.

When the European War started in 1939, this country was ill-prepared to fight a modern war, due to the lack of electrochemical and electrometallurgical plant capacity. The Members of Congress who sponsored the Bonneville project and enactment, which started some 12 to 15 years ago, were absolutely clear as to the future use of this large supply of low-cost power. It was fortunate for the country in the last war that Congress exercised this early vision. Without this vision, the air program in the last war would not have been possible.

The electrochemical and the electrometallurgical plant capacity now on the Columbia is associated closely with the atomic bomb. The Hanford plant producing the atomic bomb uses Columbia River power. We might just as well give the secrets of the atomic bomb away as to enact legislation which would drive such basic defense industries out of business or cause them to move outside of the United States. Fifty percent of the potential hydroelectric power of the United States is in the Columbia River Basin.

The situation, briefly, is both optimistic and uncertain, so far as aluminum is concerned. A competitive situation has replaced the half-century Alcoa monopoly, with Reynolds Metals Co. and Permanente Metals Corp.—Kaiser—capable of producing about as much metal as Alcoa. The tremendous, unanticipated postwar market for aluminum has changed the picture completely since the autumn of 1945, when most Government plants were down and prospects for disposal uncertain. If Reynolds and Permanente hit their scheduled stride, production will be about double a year ago and four times the best prewar year. The Government's vast war stockpile and aluminum from scrapped planes and other war material have been gobbled up by the hungry market. The price of pig aluminum has held steady at 14 cents a pound, lowest in the metal's history, while prices for steel, copper, lead, and zinc have increased considerably.

Aluminum is pouring into automotive products, including trailers, trucks, and busses, and the European trend to aluminum in passenger cars is expected to reach the United States soon, in which event "the present capacity of the aluminum and magnesium industries will be utterly inadequate"; into railroad rolling stock including passenger, hopper, tank, and subway cars; into superstructures of large ships, lifeboats, and interior partitions of vessels; into residential construction, including windows; hardware, awnings, blinds, storm sash and screen; into general structures and buildings using flat and corrugated sheet for roofs and siding.

Aluminum fabrication of small articles has increased to the limit of the sheet and ingot available from the three basic producers. NHA plans to use 400,000,000 pounds of aluminum in prefabricated houses for veterans this year. Producers and fabricators are making money, and expect to be able to maintain favorable competitive prices.

These are factors on the optimistic side. The danger of an inept, short-

range policy by the Government disposal agency already has been mentioned on the side of uncertainty. Facilities in high-cost power areas might be junked or sold for other purposes, for instance, instead of being shipped to the Northwest and added to plant capacities here. The supply of soda ash, essential in aluminum reduction, is precarious so far as Alcoa's competitors are concerned. There is an import tariff on bauxite and the Japanese islands have not been opened to exploitation. Reynolds and Kaiser still are dependent largely upon raw materials controlled by Alcoa, and binding agreements have not been completed. The Government plants awarded to the two companies are operated on short-term leases, with cancellation provisions.

But possibly the greatest danger faced by the newcomers in the tough game of aluminum is that adequate supplies of hydroelectricity for the necessary expansion of production will not be made available in the Northwest, or being made available will be forced upward in price by political and economic pressure. Every kilowatt of Northwest power available now is being utilized, and nowhere else in the Nation is there any hope of getting power at a cost approximating that in the Northwest in the next few years. Light metals cannot expand much in this area until more power is available, according to the Murray report. This should provide food for thought among those opposing more dams on the Columbia.

It would be a serious mistake to fail to provide for the construction of additional generating facilities in the Columbia River Basin to meet the demand for hydroelectric energy that will soon be with us and with no opportunity to supply the needed power. It will take some 2 years to construct and install generating facilities in existing plants and from 2 to 4 years to provide such facilities in dams to be hereafter constructed. It would be a great mistake to fail to provide now the authority and funds with which to complete installation of the remaining generators in the Grand Coulee project. The McNary Dam, construction of which is now starting, should be carried forward as rapidly as possible so that the hydroelectric power it will supply will be available when the project is completed, at which time there will be, according to the present outlook, a demand for all the energy made available.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ivan Bloch, Chief, Division of Industrial and Resources Development of the Bonneville Power Administration, on April 4, last, made an outstanding contribution to this whole subject of power and industrial development in the United States. I include as part of my remarks the following excerpts from his discussion of this important subject:

[Excerpts from Pacific Northwest Industrial Development, a paper delivered by Ivan Bloch, Chief, Division of Industrial and Resources Development, of the Bonneville Power Administration, before the Chicago section of the Electrochemical Society, Chicago, Ill., April 4, 1947]

In this paper, I will describe the growth of Pacific Northwest power supplies and electroprocess industries, and the national need for more power supplies in that region.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST GROWTH

From the time I first met with your society, some 9 years ago, the power sales of the Bonneville Power Administration have increased between 50-fold and 70-fold. The revenues from power sales, of course, reflect this growth. They have increased 70 times. From the beginning of power operations in 1938 to the end of 1947, we have sold a total of 35,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, with a total revenue of over \$90,000,000. Our generating capacity has increased from roughly 100,000 kilowatts at Bonneville Dam in mid-1938 to a total name-plate rating of 1,176,400 kilowatts at Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. Our transmission system has kept pace with this growth. In 1940, we had about 200 miles of high-capacity transmission lines. Today, the entire system is almost 2,900 circuit miles.

On the basis of energy deliveries, this system is now the third largest in the United States. Together with other publicly owned systems, it is supplying well over half of the total generation of the combined power systems of the Pacific Northwest.

The expected slump in power use upon cessation of hostilities did materialize in the region, but was of surprisingly short duration. At the present time, the demand on the Bonneville-Grand Coulee system is so great that all equipment is being used to full capacity, without reserves. And the region is clamoring for more power.

The growth of electric-power consumption in the Pacific Northwest is indicative of what is happening to industrial and economic expansion in the region. In our annual report to the Congress for the fiscal year 1946, which ended in June of 1946, it was shown that during the period of maximum peak demand for that year of 1,346,000 kilowatts, 44.7 percent of the capacity was utilized for Pacific Northwest industry on our system; 35.2 percent was utilized by the private power utilities of the region; 12 percent went for publicly owned power utilities; and the remainder, 7.9 percent, was divided between requirements of Military Establishment and system losses. Further analysis reveals that of the total peak distribution referred to above, 37.3 percent was for aluminum production, 7.6 percent was for other major electroprocess industries.

During the closing years of the war, many skeptics railed about this fabulous growth. We had expected to hear from the prophets of doom on our power system—after all, was it not a Government operation? We were not disappointed: "Power to burn"—we were told, "white elephants." In answer, we stated, and I think we demonstrated conclusively, that this war growth was the result of a pent-up potential which was bound to be satisfied. The war, we averred, had accelerated an eventual development.

To be sure, after VJ-day many of our war plants closed down. Our load dropped. We thought we would have a breather to rehabilitate electrical equipment which had been overloaded by as much as 25 percent for months on end. But our breather didn't last, and today we are facing a power shortage in the region.

At the present time, the Pacific Northwest aluminum plants are all back on the line, with the exception of the Tacoma plant, which is to resume operations within a few weeks. Not only that, but the aluminum producers are constantly hammering at us for additional power supplies for new pot lines in addition to those now in the region. We have had to turn them down.

Most of you are familiar with the fact that aluminum consumption in the United States, instead of collapsing, as many skeptics proclaimed, has already expanded four to five times prewar loads, far beyond most optimistic estimates. Although a portion of the market was created by shortages in other materials, notably sheet steel, the places where aluminum is now used profitably are legion.

The same general story applies to other electroprocess industries which located in the region during the war. However, some have closed down; one of the calcium-carbide plants, one of the ferro-alloy plants, and the magnesium plant. On the other hand, since VJ-day, new major plants have established operations in the Pacific Northwest, and others are in active stages of consideration. These additions largely make up power consumption loss by the closing down of certain other units. Additional production of carbide, electrolytic iron, and chlorates is now under way. Numerous other smaller industries have sprung up in every section of the area, adding to power consumption considerably. As was expected, but in greater degree, the commercial, small industrial, domestic, and rural loads have jumped up. This, of course, is true of the entire Nation, but the Pacific Northwest, because it is so power conscious, is outstripping the rest of the country. These, therefore, are the reasons why the Pacific Northwest does not have a surplus of power but rather faces a deficit.

NATIONAL IMPORTANCE

I would not deny a natural urge and motivation to argue the necessity for the industrial development and economic growth of the Pacific Northwest. But, it seems to me there are compelling reasons beyond those which might be termed somewhat provincial: the national well-being and security demand an expansion of Pacific Northwest power supplies. By and large, only in this area of the Nation can be found the hydropower potentials—of firm power at low rates—which can assure the required national expansion of electroprocess industries.

Before proceeding with the analysis which I believe sustains this claim, let me state frankly that the statistical bases are far from complete. However, the extrapolations I must undertake reflect wide contact with those individuals throughout the United States who maintain a current awareness of conditions in electroindustries and in power supplies. Without more exhaustive studies than we have been able to undertake, the level of estimates cannot be gaged accurately but the general character of the trend can be indicated.

The total power requirements of electroprocess industries have increased at a rate somewhat more rapid than those of industry as a whole. With war demands, this would be expected. For instance, from 1939 through 1943, the total annual power requirements of national manufacturers increased from 71,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours to 147,000,000,000—about two times. For the same period, the total annual requirements of national electroprocess industries increased from slightly over 9,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours to almost 38,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours—almost four times. From our contacts with industry, it is our belief that the difference in trends in power consumption by all manufactures and electroprocess industries has not slackened appreciably. It is our expectation that this trend will continue. Perhaps a few examples may give the foundations of this belief.

National aluminum production consumed between almost 1,000,000,000 and 2,500,000,000 kilowatt hours per year during the period 1926-36. Upward progression of requirements starting in 1939 reached a total of over 18,000,000,000 kilowatt hours per year in 1943. At the peak of war production, we estimate that the requirements of the aluminum industry were around the 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hour mark—representing a production of 1,800,000,000 pounds of metal per year.

Estimated primary and secondary aluminum production for 1947, after a short slump, may reach 1,700,000,000 pounds, with total actual demands of 2,300,000,000 pounds. This latter figure does not include possible expanded demands for housing, estimated at 400,000,000,000 pounds. That is to say, the

apparent deficit of national production over national consumption in 1947 may be as high as 1,000,000,000 pounds.

In addition, the automotive and transportation field has not yet begun to make minimum feasible use of aluminum. Its feasible requirements alone, with lower primary costs of the metals and its fabrications, may require over 1,000,000,000 pounds per year. In other words, a total national aluminum market may develop, by 1960 or so, of 3,000,000,000 pounds requiring 30,000,000,000 kilowatt hours per year.

Magnesium has had its ups-and-downs. During the period 1927-32, its annual power requirements were only between three and nine million kilowatt hours. The war shot these requirements up to almost 5,000,000,000 kilowatt hours in 1943. Production has slumped but our preliminary studies make us confident that "Maggie" is going to go through a resurgence in importance which may be startling. This will be due to the development of new alloys, new fabricating methods, and the growing realization by industry of magnesium's significant advantages. The fact that there is no real limit to the supply of basic raw materials for the production of magnesium has important bearing on its growth in the light-metals field. By 1960, national magnesium markets may be as high as 300,000,000 pounds, requiring 3,000,000,000 kilowatt hours per year.

Electric furnace alloys power requirements have grown also. In 1936, for instance, these requirements were on the order of 1,750,000,000 kilowatt-hours. In 1943, they had increased about three times. We feel that increased demands for alloy and stainless steels for rapid transport units on our highways, railroads and airways, for jet propulsion and for household uses will continue the upward trend in this industry.

In copper and zinc, electrothermal and electrolytic reduction power requirements have continued to climb. At least as far as zinc is concerned, the depletion of Tri-State district ores makes it imperative that the industry utilize the complex lead-zinc ores found in the Pacific Northwest and from Australia. This places a premium on electroprocess methods. The steady upward trend in power consumption in these two industries cannot fail to continue. From about 500,000,000 to 1,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year during the period 1926-39, these requirements reached almost 3,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1943.

For calcium carbide, chlorine and caustic, electrothermal steel, and other electroprocess industries, the story is pretty much the same: A steady rise prior to the war, rapid expansion during the war, and continued rise since the war. To these must be added numerous relatively new products of the electric furnace and electrolytic cell, such as metallic calcium, metallic lithium, metallic sodium, elemental phosphorus and electric furnace fertilizer, electrolytic iron, chromium and manganese, and chlorine derivatives such as chloroethylenes and DDT. These are industries in relative infancies and, as they grow, so will their national power requirements.

NATIONAL POWER SUPPLY

The question arises whether national power supplies are rising to keep pace with this expansion. It is first necessary to review, however, the kind of power which electroindustry demands. Manufacturing industry power requirements generally are not too selective as to kind and price. On the other hand, the very nature of electroprocess industry, where power is a basic ingredient and raw material, demands extremely low unit cost, uninterrupted supply, and large homogeneous blocks of power. For example, an aluminum plant must have blocks of at least 20 to 35,000 kilowatts for each production unit. The power supply must be continuous—it cannot be shut off at will, whatever the reason, without expensive restarting of

operations. Inasmuch as 8 and 10 kilowatt-hours are required per pound of aluminum, the cost in mills, not cents, cannot be much more than 2 to 3 mills per kilowatt-hour, depending on location. Even at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, this power requirement represents between 20 and 25 percent of the production cost. Aluminum illustrates well the kind of power supply and price which is needed for the whole range of electroprocesses.

The major existing and potential locations for electroprocess industries in the United States are well known. In general, these have been hydro centers. In the East, Niagara Falls and surrounding territory has been a traditional center for this type of industry. The Tennessee Valley and surrounding area has become another important center since the building of the power facilities of the TVA. There are other rather isolated centers of major electroprocess industries.

But the limits of expansion at Niagara Falls have been reached. The potential development of the St. Lawrence waterway may not offer much relief because of the rapid expansion of nonindustrial power requirements of New York State—a market which cannot be stifled much longer by inadequate power sources. The TVA in its splendid job of river control has about reached the maximum of its hydro-power capabilities.

The general conclusion which can be reached is that, with the exception of Texas and the Southwest as a very great potential, particularly for chemical production, the West remains as the principal location for major electroprocess industry in terms of power supplies, of the kind and price required. Of the West, there is no question; as to the Northwest—it has the almost fabulous potential of some 25,000,000 more kilowatts of firm capacity beyond that already developed. The price will probably remain at the generally low levels which now exist.

FUTURE PACIFIC NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

For the past year and a half, some of us at Bonneville Power Administration have been trying to visualize what industrial expansion might be expected in the Pacific Northwest by 1960. We have searched the literature; we have ransacked files of Federal agencies; we have talked to industrial groups. We have tried to interpret technological and market trends in some 50 groups of electroprocess and satellite industries. We have tried to analyze markets in the Pacific Northwest, on the west coast, the Nation, and for export. Then we have attempted to fit those basic industrial facts to Pacific Northwest power, raw materials, markets, and freight-rate factors.

The preliminary estimates of industrial potentials provided in our staff work are food for the imagination. Several important assumptions were made—some of which you may question, others on which there can be no disagreement. First, we assumed a reasonable and steady growth of national industry based on a similarly reasonable and steady growth of population. This gave us a base for minimum estimates. Secondly, for maximum estimates, we assumed a more rapid and prosperous development of national and international trade. Thirdly, and this certainly is a point which utility experience bears out consistently, we averred that it is necessary to plan and install power generation and transmission facilities in advance of market.

We believe that, given the power supplies, industrial use of power in the Pacific Northwest will double by 1960. The increase could occur in plant expansion and establishment for the needed national production of light metals, rolled and stainless steel, ferro-alloys, nonferrous metals, nonmetals such as abrasives, phosphorus and phosphates, and other electrochemicals. We feel confident that more than 1,000,000 kilowatts could be

used in the Pacific Northwest for this type of industrial development—which, as I've pointed out, has national significance.

Some of the plant expansions listed are now under active consideration, and if interest and inquiries continue at present intensity, I am of the opinion that our estimates may become fact before 1960. Of course, it may be that the precise industries or the precise amounts will not follow our time table, but there are many other industries and industrial-power uses we have not detailed. For instance, we cannot ignore the region's peculiar energy situation.

The Northwest has long depended on wood and petroleum products for industrial and domestic fuel. Last year we made some intensive analyses, which revealed that the present consumption of energy in the region is roughly divided as follows: 37 percent from wood, 32 percent from petroleum and gas, 18 percent from coal, and, amazingly enough, 13 percent from hydroelectric sources. The depletion of timber resources, coupled with an intensive drive for more complete utilization of the full tree, are rapidly affecting the economic supplies of wood for fuel uses. Pacific Northwest petroleum consumption depends on California reserves, which are known to be declining. Oil prices are increasing. Thus, we are forced to conclude that petroleum's contribution, although it will continue to be a major and important part of our Pacific Northwest energy pattern, may decline gradually. Coal is another energy source which is uncertain. Local supplies are of high price and not always satisfactory. We hope that modern technology in the processing of sub-bituminous coal will open up the potentials of our local reserves. But no matter how optimistic we may be on these other fuels, the fact remains that hydro is the most dependable source of energy for the region's future needs.

If today we had sufficient supplies of secondary power, we would have relatively little difficulty in disposing of as much as 500,000 kilowatts for electric steam boiler operations, mainly for the region's growing pulp and paper processing. Railroad electrification—despite the difficult problem in its financing and general economics—is certainly due for expansion. Electric house heating, which is no longer subject to doubt, would absorb a veritably huge quantity of hydro energy.

In conclusion, I hope that I have been able to describe some potentials the like of which I feel sure have no parallel in the world. None of us in the Pacific Northwest make any bones about our vigorous expansionism. But we have emerged from a strictly provincial outlook to one of national appraisal. We are not now, nor have we been, of the opinion that the Nation's horizons have been shrinking. On the contrary, we believe they are expanding as never before, and that we on the west coast have a significant contribution to make to the national welfare and security. We certainly believe that the race is to the swift—and that the progress of the Pacific Northwest cannot be slowed down without impairing seriously the progress of the Nation as a whole.

(Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain excerpts.)

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, in cooperation with the State Department, announced several weeks ago that as a part of the

foreign policy of this country, that this Government would assist Greece and Turkey by affording military and financial aid.

Regardless of what we may think of the policy of the President, it is the announced policy in respect to one phase of our foreign policy. This being true, it is my position that no citizen of this country has either the moral or legal right to carry on a speech-making tour abroad in foreign countries and attempt in so doing to challenge the good faith and integrity of the United States; and by the spoken word and through the foreign press and radio, attempt to influence the conduct of foreign governments and their officers and thus incite hatred and ridicule of those in charge of our governmental affairs.

According to AP reports with date lines from Manchester, England—and I quote:

Henry A. Wallace renewed a slashing attack today on President Truman's proposal to aid Turkey and Greece, declaring it was a commitment to rush to the aid of dictators. * * * The United States, the former Vice President charged, is being directed along a road of ruthless imperialism, reaching from China to the eastern Mediterranean and from pole to pole.

Mr. Speaker, these words from a former Vice President and Cabinet member, uttered on foreign soil against those in charge of the affairs of this Government, are in my humble opinion slanderous if not treasonable.

President Truman has the power to cancel the former Vice President's passports and call him home, and break up this attempt of sabotage and fifth-column propaganda in Europe.

Let Mr. Wallace come home and write in his New Republic to his heart's content about the ideals of communism, but stop his questionable conduct in Europe.

If you, Mr. President, are going to ask the people of this country to dig into their pockets deeper and deeper to carry out your commitments abroad, and if you are to use the military in foreign lands to direct the use of the aid you propose to give, surely you can put a stop to these rabble-rousing tactics over there by our own citizens working at cross-purposes and attempting to defeat and destroy the very things you are attempting to do.

CONTROL OF THE DARDANELLES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, for 250 years, the control of the Dardanelles has been a matter of international dispute. Peter the Great, seeking warm water ports for the Russian Empire attempted to obtain control of the Straits of the Dardanelles. For over 100 years, Mr. Speaker, the British have regarded control of these straits as essential to the maintenance of their empire. For this reason, the British fought several wars, and numerous wars have been fought by the various Balkan countries. The ancient Ottoman Empire was based around the control of the straits.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that in 1926 the present Turkish dictatorial government obtained control of the straits by international agreement—the Montreux Convention, which permitted the Turks to rearm the Dardanelles.

It is important, also, Mr. Speaker, that the House should consider that both the British and Russian Governments objected to the manner in which the Turkish Government permitted Nazi war vessels to pass through the straits during the last war. Let us, as a matter of record, recall now that the Turks violated its sworn agreement during the war. It directly and flagrantly assisted the Nazi military forces and permitted them to shift troops and naval vessels from the Aegean to the Black Sea more or less as they chose. Foreign Minister Eden and the Russians during the course of the war vigorously protested these violations.

Mr. Speaker, following the conclusion of this war, the American, the British, and the Russian Governments have all demanded the rewriting of the Montreux Convention. All three of the great powers are opposed on the record to continued Turkish military control of the Dardanelles. We have asked that the Dardanelles be internationalized. The Russians have asked that the Dardanelles be controlled by the four Black Sea powers—Turkey, Russia, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

Frankly, if anyone is ever to launch an attack upon Russia, it is logical, as Mr. Walter Lippman long ago pointed out, that the most vulnerable part of Russia is her soft underbelly bordering on the Black Sea for 1,000 miles. Close to the Black Sea are the great oil fields of Baku, the large grain fields of the Ukraine, the industrial areas of Stalingrad, Karkov, Kiev, Odessa, and other areas.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, the Russians view with some alarm the exclusive control of the Straits in the hands of a power which during the war gave assistance to the Nazis in their assault upon Russia.

Obviously, the Turks might well permit at some future time an enemy fleet with aircraft carriers and battleships to attack Russia through the Dardanelles. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the Russians apparently worry about huge air fleets armed with atomic bombs based on the plains of Turkey, striking across the Black Sea at their vitals.

Mr. Speaker, these are the realities, the geographic and military realities, of the position of the Turks.

As a matter of fact, when the false news of the fall of Stalingrad came, the Turkish Army was ordered mobilized on the Russian border, prepared to strike, but when Stalingrad did not fall, the Turkish Army was withdrawn from the Russian border. This also, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of record.

We find then that the Dardanelles now controlled exclusively by Turkey, could become the cause of another war. We find also that America, Britain, and Russia have agreed that they will revise the international covenant which has given Turkey control because of the Turkish violations of that agreement during the war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we propose to rearm the Turkish Government. We propose to send a military mission. We propose to pour hundreds of millions of dollars into the Turkish armed forces.

What, Mr. Speaker, does the present bill before the Congress imply as to our intentions? In effect, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the passage of the present bill as it includes Turkey, means that we have established a military alliance with the Turkish Government. The passage of this bill will mean that we guarantee continued Turkish exclusive armed control of the Dardanelles. It will mean, Mr. Speaker, that the Turkish armed forces will have become the responsibility of the American Government and of the American taxpayer. Mr. Speaker, it can only mean that our armed services have decided that Turkey shall be the battleground of a new world war against Russia.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately, there is another course open to us. Under the UN we are committed to present before that body any condition—economic, political, or military—which threatens the peace of the world. If we believe that the Dardanelles is a cause which might lead to war, why does not our good President, Mr. Truman, request our delegate to the UN to present the question before that august body? Why have we in violation of our commitments to the UN decided to take unilateral action in respect to continued Turkish armed control of these straits? The course of the administration means war. On the contrary, to present this question before the UN means peace. Collective action against aggression; collective actions to remove the causes of war; collective action to eliminate those problems such as the Dardanelles—this is the way to maintain peace. It is the way to build up the UN; but the course that we have proposed is unilateral action. We and we alone have made the decision. We alone have decided to maintain and continue Turkish armed control of the Dardanelles. We and we alone have decided to build a military alliance with a dictatorial and Fascist government on the border of Russia and the Black Sea. We, in so doing, have violated our commitments to the UN; this policy, if continued, means the death of the UN and it means the destruction of international peace. Let every Member of the House, Mr. Speaker, consider well what is implied by the inclusion of Turkey in a bill which has been described to the American people as one which brings food to the hungry and clothing to the naked. Let us not construct a military alliance with a Fascist government under the guise of aid to the relief and food for the poor. Hypocrisy is not the basis for constructive international policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. I know, of course, there is a ball game, and I know also that some of us want to see the cherry blossoms and I assure you I am not going to keep you very long. In any event I am terribly distressed about this issue.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate what the gentleman said about the people in his district being disturbed about these emergencies. I am sure the people in most districts are disturbed over the emergencies. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio if, in his opinion, there is not a real emergency in the Turkish-Greek situation today? Would he call it an emergency or would he say it is not an emergency?

Mr. BENDER. I say to the gentleman there is no emergency beyond that of feeding the hungry and clothing the naked.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I have listened to the gentleman with much interest. As a matter of fact, we debated this issue the other night. I would like to know what the gentleman proposes as an alternative? Does he propose appeasing Russia?

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentleman know that there is an appropriation now before us involving some \$350,000,000 for appeasing Russia's satellite countries?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If there is such an appropriation I am against it.

Mr. BENDER. There is such an appropriation and the administration is asking us to support it.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I can assure the gentleman if that is the intent and purpose of the particular appropriation I am against it. But will the gentleman answer the question?

Mr. BENDER. I think it was a mistake that we appeased her to the extent we already have. It was Mr. Roosevelt's mistake.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. What does the gentleman think will happen if we allow Russia to take all of Europe?

Mr. BENDER. We have already allowed her to take most of Europe.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would the gentleman continue to allow her to take Europe?

Mr. BENDER. No; but I do not think that is involved in this issue at all. I think the gentleman is reading something into this that is not there.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDOWELL. The gentleman from Louisiana asked for an alternative. England is broke, so she is getting out of Greece. Two hundred miles away England is fighting an aggressive war in Palestine. Why not take the Palestine troops and put them over there in Greece and you have the problem solved?

Mr. BENDER. Yes. There is a hundred thousand British troops in Palestine. We have stated our policy. Mr. Truman has said he disagrees with Great Britain on Palestine. The British say they cannot afford to carry on the

10,000 troops they have in Greece. If Mr. Truman is consistent then he would call on the British to take some of these troops out of Palestine and settle that problem over there and do something about that situation. We disagree with their position there and they could send their troops into Greece.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that the emergency exists in Greece but it is not our emergency, that the British ought to take care of it?

Mr. BENDER. The British emergency is this: The banks in England have hundreds of millions of dollars in Greek loans. They hold a mortgage on Greece that we do not have. We are underwriting that mortgage to the British bankers.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Let me get the gentleman's premise correctly. What does the gentleman advocate; that we do nothing about Greece?

Mr. BENDER. I am interested in feeding the hungry and clothing the poor. To feed the hungry and clothe the naked, I would be willing to vote for an appropriation of \$50,000,000 for Greece, and that is all, for this year.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Who would administer that appropriation? Would you not have the same situation that you had under Tito?

Mr. BENDER. I most certainly would not have the monarchy that now exists in Greece administer it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARTIN of Iowa). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Journal of the American Bar Association.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the National Policy Committee.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1009. An act to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base 6 property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 875. An act to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 15, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

528. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

529. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

530. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780, 34 U. S. C. 495a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503, 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft, known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

531. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

532. A letter from the Secretary, National Park Trust Fund Board, transmitting a report of the National Park Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

533. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 2 of the joint resolution approved November 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 764), relating to the arming of American vessels; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

534. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, T. H.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

535. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a limitation on the construction of family quarters for the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

536. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a government for American Samoa; to the Committee on Public Lands.

537. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

538. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State and Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to permit United States common communications carriers to accord free communication privileges to official participants in the world telecommunications conferences to be held in this country in 1947; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

539. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the bimonthly report of the Reconstruction

Finance Corporation small-business activities during the period December 1 through 31, 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

540. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942, exempting certain real property from taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

541. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

542. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed revision for the fiscal year 1947, in the form of an amendment to House Document No. 100, Eightieth Congress, for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 192); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

543. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$2,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 193); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

544. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$28,800, together with a proposed provision affecting an appropriation for the legislative branch, Library of Congress, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 194); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARTLEY: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3020. A bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 495. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1448. A bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902; without amendment (Rept. No. 247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 178. Resolution to provide for the consideration of H. R. 3020, a bill to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the pub-

lic health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 248). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1465. A bill to relieve collectors of customs of liability for failure to collect certain special tonnage duties and light money, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1467. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," of June 15, 1917, as amended, and the Alien Registration Act, 1940, to increase the penalties for violation of such acts; without amendment (Rept. No. 250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1565. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions"; with amendments (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1566. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States"; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1567. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; without amendment (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2083. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; with amendments (Rept. No. 254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBSION: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2084. A bill to codify and enact into positive law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; without amendment (Rept. No. 255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3028. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3029. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for preparation of plans and specifications for a courthouse to accommodate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3030. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3031. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 so as to express the policy that surplus property suitable for

educational uses may be donated to the several States, or to certain educational institutions thereof; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3032. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3033. A bill relating to assignments of claims against the United States for consideration for performance of personal services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3034. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3035. A bill providing for payments to the State of Wyoming and for rights-of-way, including stock driveways, over and across Federal lands within the exterior boundary of the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3036. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public, No. 534, 78th Cong.); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 3037. A bill to increase the categories of property which may be donated by the Army and Navy to schools, colleges, and universities, and the purposes for which such property may be used; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of House Report No. 209, Eightieth Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 181. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 245, current session, submitted to accompany the bill H. R. 3020, relating to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. Res. 182. Resolution to authorize the payment of 6 months' salary and funeral expenses to the widow of the late R. C. Hicks; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States regarding the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to approve pending legislation concerning the use of surplus military lands for national cemeteries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to revise the Internal Revenue Code of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

in relation to appropriations affecting the United States customs service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3038. A bill for the relief of Lillian Jeffries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3039. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 3040. A bill for the relief of Alexander and Alma Hofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

322. By Mr. COTTON: Petition of New Hampshire State Board of Education, recommending that Congress amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

323. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 14 residents of New Castle, Lawrence County, Pa., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

324. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of Rev. O. H. Spence, of Salisbury, Md., and 53 others, in support of S. 265 and any other bills of similar character, to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

325. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Association of Collegiate Deans and Registrars in Negro Schools, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for liberal financial grants to the States for elementary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on Appropriations.

326. Also, petition of Miss Pearl Arnold, secretary, Lake Worth Townsend Club, No. 1, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

327. Also, petition of Mr. Anthony Nicastrì, and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the 1-cent increase in the District of Columbia gasoline tax; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Lindsey B. Trone, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Carlsbad, N. Mex., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, enable us so to put our trust in Thee that we may be

aware of Thy presence in our hearts and lives and that we may worthily magnify and glorify Thy holy name.

Help us to be humble in Thy sight, for we know "the higher we are placed, the more humbly should we walk."

Deliver us from pettiness. Help us to see all things in their proper perspective—thus shall we be delivered from "majoring in minors." "In all our ways may we acknowledge Him and He shall direct our paths."

Forgive us of our sins. Empower us by Thy spirit. Strengthen us for every task, we pray, in His dear name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 11, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 15, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; and

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 731) to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 495. An act to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1448. An act to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902;

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 2659. An act to establish a program for the rehabilitation of alcoholics, promote

temperance, and provide for the medical and scientific treatment of persons found to be alcoholics by the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 875. An act to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites; and

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF NIGHT SESSIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I desire to announce that we expect to hold and will hold a session of the Senate on Wednesday night of this week, and that the Senate will not recess for the dinner hour but will run right through that time. I desire further to announce that there is a probability that there will also be a night session on Thursday of this week if the Grecian loan measure is not concluded by that time.

POLLUTION CONTROL IN STREAMS— NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to give notice, on behalf of the Committee on Public Works, that public hearings will begin on Tuesday, April 22, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 412 Senate Office Building, on Senate bill 418, which is a bill dealing with pollution control in the streams of the country. The hearings will be held before the Subcommittee on River and Harbor Improvements, of which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is chairman.

CONTROL OF EXPORTATION AND IMPORTATION OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR (H. DOC. NO. 195)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 3422.)

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.